

OCT 27 1911

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE
519126
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLI—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, 1911.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1911

CONTENTS

I. FOREIGN MISSIONS AS A WORKING BASIS FOR LUTHERAN UNITY.	467
BY REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.	
II. THE MOST RECENT ASSAULTS OF THE HIGHER CRITICAL THEOLOGY ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST.	474
BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D.	
III. THE NEW MEASURE MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.	505
BY REV. GEORGE SCHOLL, D.D.	
IV. THE LIFE AND MESSAGE OF TOLSTOI.	516
BY REV. UPTON A. HANKEY, D.D.	
V. CHRIST'S PERSONAL PRESENCE.	533
BY REV. LEANDER KEYSER, D.D.	
VI. EXPOSITION OF LENT.	540
BY REV. A. D. POTTS, D.D., PH.D.	
VII. KARL MARX.	556
BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.	
VIII. RITUALISM.	574
BY REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.	
IX. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.	583
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR A. E. WENTZ, A.M., M.D.	
X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.	596
<p>Missionary Heroes of the Lutheran Church—The Inner Missions—Theory and Practice of Foreign Missions—Growth of the Missionary Concept—The Bible and Modern Life—The Way of Life, or Why Should You be a Christian and a Church Member—Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche—The Book of Concord—Commentary on the Book of Job—The Basal Belief of Christianity—Harriet Beecher Stowe—Papers on Inter-Racial Problems—The Eisenach Gospel Selections Made Ready for Pulpit Work—The Homiletic Review—The Missionary Review of the World—The Literary Digest—Eucharist or the Lord's Supper—The End of Darwinism—The Religious Possibilities of the Motion Picture—The Ideal College President—Rome vs. America—The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—its Aims and Tendency—Sir Edward Grey on Union for the World Peace—List of Arbitration Treaties, Compiled by Denys P. Myers;—Syndicates for War, or the Influence of the Makers of War Material and of Capital Invested in War Supplies;—The Grange and Peace.</p>	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

FOREIGN MISSIONS AS A WORKING BASIS FOR LUTHERAN UNITY.

REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.

Christian unity, and how to realize it, is worthy the Church's serious attention. That the whole subject is involved in great difficulties, is no good reason against its being considered by all Christ's followers.

In His prayer for the future Church, He expressed clearly the thought of union among His followers.

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they may all be one; as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they may also be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

Here the nature of the union, as between Father and Son, the means to secure it, the Word, and the end or purpose, that Christ may be accepted as God-sent, are all involved and clearly set forth.

Foreign missions is helpful in a two-fold manner toward the realization of unity. On the one hand it presents virgin soil, in which to begin operations without there being in the mind of the heathen world the bias of our denominational peculiarities, differences or idiosyncracies, and on the other it has a task before it to which it calls the Church which can only be accomplished by the most effective means at her disposal and by the wisest use of her forces. It may be safely assumed as sound, to hold that a united Christianity, working with the least possible friction and waste, and with the largest harmony, shall be able

most successfully to proclaim our holy faith and discharge our responsibility to a non-evangelized world.

Movements in the mission fields call the attention of the Church most definitely to reconsider her position on Christian unity.

The Protestant Episcopal Church at the Cincinnati Conference uttered her faith, which Cardinal Gibbons recently commended as "reflecting honor on their heads and hearts."

As he views the matter of Christian unity, it is attainable "only where government is maintained as no less essential to the Church of Christ than unity of doctrine," and this essential condition is found only, he holds, in Rome.

But we are not permitted by our subject to discuss the wider phase of Christian unity; nor to show how foreign missions furnish a basis for all Protestant, and some think, for all Christian bodies, but to refer only to the question from the standpoint of Lutheranism. Does the foreign mission enterprise furnish a basis for Lutheran unity? If it presents a *practical* basis for all Protestants and a *possible* one, as intimated, for the whole of Christianity, then it must follow that it affords the necessary working basis on which unity should be realized most fully in the Lutheran Church.

Again, whether this is admitted or not, whether it can be maintained or not, it is certainly true, that the presence of so great a task calls for the utilization of all the forces at our command in the most effective way; and it will generally be conceded by all as a truth of much potency that in union of action there is strength and the promise of ultimate victory.

We claim only limited vision and experience, both in the practical work of missions and in the realization of co-operation in the foreign field. But what follows is not theory but what has been gained in the school of experience, and among our Lutheran missions in the Empire of India. And lest misunderstanding should arise, it may be well to lay down the general proposition that *essential doctrinal agreement in fundamentals* must be held as necessary to successful agreement in missionary work. Where this is absent, unity cannot be secured or maintained with any effectiveness. Oneness in government is not in our opinion nearly so essential as doctrine, in effecting Christian unity, though here is where the line of cleavage is deepest among Protestantism and between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.

Now this being admitted as a preliminary consideration, we maintain that in all parts of the Lutheran Church and in all lands doctrinal agreement is sufficiently attained to constitute a working basis for all divisions and nationalities of our Lutheran fold. Nowhere more surely is this true than among Lutheran missionaries at their great task before a heathen world.

There have been secured such practical results in the work and among the workers, as must of necessity have followed from doctrinal agreement.

In the foreign field Lutheranism, as our expression of Christian thought and life has many advantages over other conceptions and schools of thought. On the question of church government, she has no hard and fast rule to maintain. She can adopt any of the existing forms and have historical sanction for the same in her past. In doctrine she has a simple, but remarkably comprehensive creed which from the first, has helped her in confessing her Lord among the nations. Her Augustana stand as one of the most translatable, if not the most easily translated of symbols—a marvellous compendium of the faith, setting forth the fundamentals of Christian truth in clearness, and unencumbered with strained interpretations of the gospel message or conceptions of the divine plan.

But how does the foreign mission field present so advantageous a basis for Lutheran unity? Let us face our task as a great Church. We are all aware how linguistic barriers and national peculiarities militate against Lutheran unity, even where we all confess our faith in the common symbol of Lutheranism. It is natural for Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, Finns, et. al., to flow together, impelled by their common national ties. But it is not so easy to weld these national traits and the many-tongued sons of Luther together so as to form what they should be, because of their common faith, the mightiest force in Protestantism, numerically and doctrinally, as well as practically. When, however, the national elements meet in China, Japan, India, or Africa, the problems assume a different aspect. Each has not a large work to do among those who speak their own tongue as here in America, but all find a common task, a common foe—one mighty work, to make the Lord of life known; and the common faith which they express in the Augustana, becomes the common rallying ground from which to start against the common enemy, and to do the common work. We had no idea how easy it would

be to draw together the nations represented in the Lutheran Church of India until we tried it, and then as true Lutherans, we did not begin at the outskirts of the problem, but we started with our faith as expressed in our Church confession—the Augsburg—and put *first things first, what we held ought to be taught*; and church government and missionary methods as second, concerning which we hoped to learn constantly from each other.¹

We came together, it is true, impelled by our stupendous task and to learn how to do it best. That must draw all Christians together. But we should not be so superficial as to put this and the study of the best methods of doing it, before the essential and fundamental truths which our Church confesses and has confessed from the beginning of her history. We have studied methods and have been mutually benefitted. But this is small as compared with the growing unity and the strength that unity affords and develops in the performance of the mighty work to be done. Our Lutheran unity attained already is not all that is possible, either in character or effectiveness, but it has produced such fruit already as to show what are its possibilities.

Let us note briefly the past accomplishment and sketch some possible undertakings.

An understanding of conditions in our India Lutheran Church is important. We are scattered from Cape Comorin to the Himalayan Mountains. Our missions represent nationally the most prominent Lutheran lands. Our work is done in many vernaculars and dialects. Our problems are somewhat dissimilar due to linguistic and other considerations. Yet notwithstanding these they are very largely alike in ultimate aim. We agree that we could begin united work among our twelve missions in the language of modern educated India—the English. And so five years ago, and let it be said not at the instigation of those whose tongue it was, but at the suggestion of those who spoke other tongues, we united in publishing a common organ, *The Gospel Witness*.

Within the Telugu area among four missions, two American with some Swedish and Danish and German elements, we determined to furnish the same Lutheran literature and common ritual and have been jointly supporting a literary editor who is

¹ Guntur Conference agreed on Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechisms as a doctrinal basis.

providing Sunday School Lesson Helps and other books for our congregations and parochical schools, Sunday Schools and Gospel Workers.

We have worked out a common examination scheme for all grades of Gospel workers, maintain a central examination board whose duties are to examine all candidates for the missions in the subjects agreed upon by the central board of the co-operating missions.

The general spirit elicited by these combined efforts of the missionaries has been most beneficial and has reacted most helpfully upon the native Church and native workers in the whole Telugu field.

Unrealized aims that should be pushed to completion are worth noting and urging.

1. Within suitable language areas there should be a *union theological seminary*.² Preliminary steps were taken to establish this but it may be too soon to say what hindrances were encountered, as it might prevent the realization of the desired end. There can be no valid excuse for maintaining four separate theological training schools in the Telugu language area, when one good one could do all the work and do it more effectively. If the theological work is to be carried on in English, there is no reason why a common training school should not be maintained by all who confess the Augsburg Confession and acknowledge the symbols of our Church as a correct interpretation of God's Word. This aim is not being forgotten and the coming joint conference of 1912 may again revive an interest in it which the home Churches and Boards would do well to heed and make effective.

In general, in all institutional work, leper asylums, industrial plants for training workers, normal schools, hospital work, &c., every reason exists for intermissionary effort. Our Boards ought to allow the native Lutheran Church to grow together, to cultivate the common inheritance of our Lutheran history and doctrinal development and to build up a strong Lutheran consciousness within the India Church by maintaining that faith which centers around the person of Christ and which makes the testimony of our Lutheran Church so valuable an element in the

² Last summer steps were taken to unite all Lutheran Missions in a Joint College at Guntur and a Joint Theological School in Madras in which English shall be the language used and our Boards have been asked to cooperate.

mighty task, the whole Church of Christ must accomplish in India and in the world.

So long as fidelity to the faith of Christ as confessed by our Church is maintained, the more unitedly our Lutheran missionaries and missions act, the greater the result will be to the kingdom and the more influential factor in hastening the coming of that kingdom they will become. The Lutheran Church maintains a Christology that India in the years to come will appreciate, as she rediscovers the wealth of our past thought on this central doctrine. We dare not allow thinly veiled monism to usurp the place of a stalwart Christology. Through the much lauded liberal theology of the West, it is to be feared that a weak soteriology may find its way to that land, where *Monism* has maintained sway for past centuries.

Preliminary to the missions getting together more closely and working more unitedly in the foreign field, may we in conclusion make the following suggestions:

1. We ought to agree on the home field to place no barrier in the way of unity of action when the forces, in the front are agreed to move together. This is fundamental. We are not set to establish our American, German, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, or any other national species of the Lutheran Church in any foreign land. We are called to establish a Chinese, India, Japan Church in the faith of Luther and his followers, if such an interpretation of the Gospel message appeals to those who shall be won from heathenism by our missionary enterprise and effort. We shall do our work best, in our humble opinion, if we allow that broad faith and liberty, which characterized our founder to find expression in the new Church's life, ever remembering and insisting upon the great principle of loyalty to God's Word, and to the faith of the Church as founded on that Word.

2. But more than this, we should labor to draw closer together our home forces, so as to furnish a worthy example to our missions of our common faith and unity derived therefrom. Our missionaries have a rather serious task in differentiating our American species of Lutheranism in India for example. The native Church can easily grasp our national and linguistic differences, but find it hard to see in these any adequate reason for difference in our common faith and in our views on Christ and His great salvation. Our common task, our common aim,

in all our foreign work cannot but draw us nearer together at home. Were we to meet and talk over the stupendous task before our *common Lutheranism*, both because of our position in the world ecclesiastically, doctrinally and numerically, and also because of the vast potentiality of personality and wealth at our command, it would, without doubt, put to rest, minor differences between us. Our great responsibility, in the greatest undertaking in the world, and our position of advantage in undertaking a large share of the task because of our ability and resources, will fill our churches with that uniting bond that would cause all lesser interests to be forgotten in our common struggle for our common Lord.

3 Finally, let us remember that the problem of Church unity is primarily one, the solution of which must be found in the home Church. It is left to home Boards and their constituting constituency to make the real advance possible for which the Church on the foreign field is waiting,—union at home so as to give force and direction to every movement that is made toward union on the foreign field.

If it is true that unity is something richer, grander, more comprehensive, than anything we can see at present, then ought our Lutheran Church strive for it "with every power engaged," thus helping, in full loyalty to Christ, to answer His prayer to our Father, "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent one."

If "unity is, in fact, a synonym for the life of the body of Christ," then it must express itself in our dear Church, as it walks nearer His side, as well as in the whole body of Christ. For this we should all humbly pray that it may find expression through us both at home and abroad, more and more increasingly.

The striking words of the Bishop of Southwark on the larger unity of Christendom, might be true among our own Church in all lands: "Slowly, very slowly, directly and indirectly, by the more interior forces of religious life and by the influences of the larger changes in human thought and human life, does the Holy Spirit work to lift us out of the pits, which have been dugged for our feet, to disentangle gently the meshes in which we are caught."

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE II.

THE MOST RECENT ASSAULTS OF THE HIGHER
CRITICAL THEOLOGY ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D (LEIPSIG).

The city of Berlin, the beautiful capital of modern Germany, was just about a year ago the scene of a very remarkable demonstration. More than 20,000 people thronged the plaza outside the mammoth colosseum of the Winter Circus. They stormed and packed the building in a trice and on the outside scarce a perceptible dimunition, so spectators say, was made in the thronging, surging multitudes. And hark, hear the swelling tones of the myriad-voiced throng. They are singing Luther's Battle Hymn—"Ein Feste Burg ist unser Gott." After intense indoor and outdoor demonstrations, the people still refuse to separate and, by special permission, the new cathedral, Germany's Westminster Abbey, is thrown open and a mighty service of thanksgiving is there held, with service and sermon by the court preacher, Dr. Dryander.

What was this all about—this stirring profoundly of a great city?

It was a popular confession of Jesus Christ, very God of very God and very man of very man by children of the faith, who thus protested against an address which had been previously made in the same city by Prof. Arthur Drews in which, abetted by a number of other adherents of Haeckel's *Monisten Bund*, he had publicly and high-handedly denied the very existence of Him whom we know and worship as the Christ of God.

This attack of Drews is a symptom of the times, and just one of a number of assaults on the founder and centre of the Christian faith. Since Strauss, Bauer and Renan, aggressions against the person and suzerainty of Jesus Christ have been more and more frequent.

The book of Dr. Schweitzer of Strasburg,¹ "From Reimarus to Werde," gathers up and discusses a mass of these movements.

¹ Dr. Albert Schweitzer—*Vo Reimarus zu Werde, Eine Geschichte der Leben Jesus Forschung*. Tübingen, 1906.

Later than this, Prof. Sanday of Oxford,² in his "Life of Christ in Recent Research," takes up the trend of this ebb and flow, attack and counter-attack in the conflict about the person of Christ. But so rapid has been the movement that even since the close of Sanday's book there have been a number of eventful happenings that are deserving of a survey. It is these I wish to present.

These new attacks are more extravagant perhaps than most, if not any, that have preceded them. They are not entirely illogical, however, when once one grants their materialistic basis, whether Monistic, Marxistic, Mythologic or Philosophic.

Indeed we shall find that though we may be abashed at the very audacity of some of the assaults, they are only notable because of a greater daring in using the same old weapons which were already forged by other hands and have been brandished in a more or less threatening way over the head of Christianity for now a very long time.

And we shall not be surprised at the number nor sharpness of the attacks. For on the one hand, as we are well aware, all historic and philologic landmarks, in all departments of thought, have been in very recent time under assault, including of course the Old and New Testaments. And on the other hand, there is general recognition that Christianity as it is stands or falls with Jesus Christ. Therefore the attack has focussed on His person.

In order that we may have a grasp of the situation I shall bring under review five several attacks on Christ, all of which are so recent that the echoes of them are still rumbling.

These five may be considered under the names of Maurnbrecher, Kautsky, Kalthoff, Jensen and Drews, in the order named. They will give us, I think, right clearly, the historical and logical development of the movement in its main essentials.

In our order of consideration we shall have a descending series.

Maurnbrecher acknowledges the reality of Jesus, grounds the work of Jesus socially, and rates His influence rather high. Kautsky acknowledges the reality of Jesus, also grounds the work of Jesus socially, but thinks His influence trifling or nil. Kalthoff, going a step further, denies the very existence of Jesus and bases Christianity on social forces. Jensen, too, denies the

² Wm. Sanday—*The Life of Christ in Recent Research*. Oxford Press, 1907.

existence of Jesus and sees the origin of Christianity in Oriental Mythology. Drews emphatically rejects Jesus as a historical character and bases Christianity on literary-historical grounds. I am inclined to say: "*Facilis descensus averni.*"

M. Maurnbrecher³ is a socialist with theological training. He acknowledges the historicity of Jesus and gives to Him a place of influence, but he denies that Jesus is the founder of Christianity.

He sketches the life of Jesus in something of this fashion: The extent of his public activity was at most about half a year. When John the Baptist was executed, Jesus who was his disciple went on preaching with a martyr's enthusiasm the new international idea of the Kingdom of God. He set forth this preaching in Capernaum for some weeks, then must flee to escape the clutches of Herod and the Pharisees. He makes several other attempts to be heard, notably in Nazareth and Decapolis. They are failures. Then comes a flight of some months and a tempestuous ingress into Jerusalem. By his teachings, parables and attack on temple barterings he made embittered enemies of Scribe and Pharisee. His frank assertion of the overthrow of the temple was reckoned as blasphemy and led to his arrest, and as a broken and self-deceived man he is finally condemned by Pilate. Dark and hopeless were his last days. In deep despair he passes from the scene of his life's failure. Let us now see the argument of Maurnbrecher, made out of this inverted view of the world-Redeemer.

Jesus lived, true, as we have seen, a failure in a way, but He lived, though indeed He had but little to do with the founding of Christianity as a movement. Jesus was not the Messiah, had not so given Himself out, was not even a rebel against the Roman Government.

But yet Jesus gave occasion for Christianity, in His work and sympathy for the poor. The social interest, Maurnbrecher makes to dominate the work of Christ.

This emphasis at once minimizes both the national and the religious sides of Christ's life. Maurnbrecher says, "Political matters were not in the scope of Jesus' thought; He neither organized an economic communism, nor led a band of rebel troops."⁴

3 M. Maurnbrecher—*Von Nazareth nach Golgotha, Eine Untersuchung.*

4 Maurnbrecher—*Jesus*, p. 197.

His purpose was rather international, rather towards a social solidarity for all men's welfare everywhere. Naturally this is purely a civic, social matter, having to do with material bettering.

And this brings us to the chief failure of Maurnbrecher. While he internationalizes Jesus' work, he practically ignores the religious side.

The chief emphasis in the New Testament is laid on the parables which refer to the poor. They are interpreted altogether without regard to moral or religious qualities. The poor in purse—not in spirit—are the recipients of all the message and ministry. If at times it must be acknowledged that Jesus looked away to the future, this is counted only a self-deception on His part, which finally led to His discomfiture, or perhaps it is a reading into His life of what really was not there.

But it requires no stretch of imagination at all for any real student of the life of Jesus to feel and know that first and chiefest of all, Christ's consciousness of God and His oneness with the divine, not mere social economies, were the real foci of His life. Rich and poor were alike to Him—if they were poor in spirit, or if they hungered and thirsted after righteousness. He reprimands the rich barn builder, not because he is rich, but because he has left God out of account. He calls to question the poor man who is over anxious about the morrow, because he fails to take God's care into account. Recall, too, how Jesus attacks Scribes and Pharisees not only as a class but to show the inner motive of the Gospel. Even Maurnbrecher himself acknowledges that Jesus in much of His dealing sets moral purity above cultural purity.

One cannot at all interpret the essence of Jesus' teaching as essentially and first of all social. Says Windisch,⁵ "Maurnbrecher must himself have felt that his derivation of all the expressions of Jesus out of pure proletarian instincts and motives does violence to the spirit of Jesus and leads to an altogether false construction of His teaching and life. The Gospel of Jesus is too broad and pure to permit itself to be grasped through such a modern constructive principle."

Maurnbrecher builds Christianity on the idea, at home in

5 H. Windisch, Leipzig—*Der Geschichtliche Jesus Theologische Rundschau* June 1910, pag. 215. Privat docent, N. Test., Leipzig.

Jewish thought as he says, of the "Son of Man." The New Testament passages on the Son of Man he accepts in general, attaching to them significance apart from the person of Christ, who he says, referred to a third person and not to Himself—and thus grounded the new movement in an already fixed idea held by the Jews—namely the "Son of Man myth," a natural prophetic idea, as Maurnbrecher terms it. This Son of Man idea refers to the believers or new party, then to Jesus Himself—at least according to Johannes Weiss Jesus felt that He would be raised to Son of Man.

Now in this so-called Son of Man mythology there are sagas of dying and resurrection. So this is passed on to Jesus. We have here a Judaic and not Syriac origin, not Syrian Adonis, but an idea of the Jewish apocalypse. But the theory breaks down utterly at the historical point—"raised again on the third day." In spite of all efforts, "the third day," "after three days" proves New Testament historical faith. No effort can show that this three days was anywhere to be found except in the story of Jesus Christ.

Windisch declares after careful consideration that "pre-Christian story of this Son of Man lying three days in the grave is not possible of proof."⁶

With this agrees Dalmann, *Words of Jesus*, (Macmillan, p. 235), and Knowling's *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, (Lecture I and II. Conclusions).

Neither the Apocalypses of Enoch or Daniel have any such idea. In fact right at this point there is an absolute break-down. Apocalypses there were. General ideas of death and figures of quickening were included in them. But nowhere the "three days" which always accompanies the telling of the New Testament resurrection narrative.

Maurnbrecher fails then in explaining the life of Jesus. His apocalyptic Son of Man myth does not bear careful investigation. And even less in harmony with facts than that, is his replacing Christ's religious ideas with motives and ideas purely social.

In spite of this Maurnbrecher sees Christ cannot be resolved into mere myth. He acknowledges the genuineness of the "Acts of the Apostles." Agrees that Luke's gospel is early. Indeed he concedes that for him for whom Christianity is an actual re-

⁶ Windisch—*Th. Rundschau* June 1910, page 211.

lation of the soul with the living God, that for such an one (and shall we not say that this is Christianity—a relation of soul and Saviour) the historical beginnings of the religion (Christianity) must necessarily rest in a supernatural divine creature.

Yet he makes the first Christian Brotherhood to be built not in the life of a divine Saviour, but in the voluntary determinations of the disciples, and finally dissolves the historic life of Jesus into illusion and myth and romance. (In the "Religious Gespräch" at Berlin, "It, the Church, arose out of myth. Without myth we should not have had her.")⁷ Thus our Christianity has arisen at the price of the liquidation of its chief asset—Jesus the Logos. So we may say that his view of the "Son of Man" myth, only after the death of Jesus, was centered upon Him, that the real secret of Christianity's origin lay in this afterthought of a deceased and forlorn peasantry, that Jesus Himself in all His efforts was moved peculiarly merely by economic considerations and that His life and death for Christianity, had, at the farthest, only a shadowy influential significance—all this, we say, is then as airy gauze, unable to meet historic conditions, incapable of giving even a partial solution of the true significance of Jesus Christ.

Next we come to the consideration of the position of K. Kautsky,⁸ the socialist follower of Marx. He believes Jesus lived, but that His influence so far as the Christianity of to-day is concerned, is absolutely nil. This attitude is simpler and more negative than that of Kalthoff. Jesus' influence such as it was arose out of economic and social conditions then prevailing. These conditions necessitated the awakening of the Christian ideas. The ecclesiastical priesthood, the aristocratic plutocracy, the lazy and indifferent proletariat were each elements of preparation for a new organic social life.

Yet Kautsky seeks the initial grounds of Christianity not alone in these general movements, but more especially in the local economic and political conditions of Palestine itself. He sees then not four but five political parties. In addition to the well-to-do Sadducees, who sympathize with Rome, and the patriotic Pharisees who attempt a release from the yoke of Rome; in addi-

⁷ Jeremias, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Feb. 1911, page 153.

⁸ K. Kautsky—*Der Ursprung des christentums*, 1908. K. Kautsky—*Jesus der Rebel*, 1910.

tion to the revolutionary Zealots who conducted a continuous predatory campaign against the government and the Essenes who maintained within themselves this communistic organization,—there was a fifth organization. It included something of the tendencies of both Zealot and Essene, but, and this was its vital feature, it had adaptive and propagating capacity, in such measure as to facilitate its expansion both in and out Palestine.

Kautsky insists on the proletarian character of the early Christian Church, claims it to have been a development from the lower class of society. He is satisfied he can find all the elements of such a social condition.

There is class hate (Luke 6:24-26), Woe unto you that are rich for you have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full now for you shall hunger.

There is communism (Acts 2:34, 4:32-37), And all they that believed were together and had all things in common.

There is a contempt for labor (Matt. 6:26-28), Behold the birds of the heavens, they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feedeth them.

There is the destruction of the family (Luke 14:26), If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.

There is a future ideal state.

From this very inadequate exegesis, Kautsky goes on to base the origin of Christianity on the Church as a community. The core of the movement is not an individual at all, but a social body in a community group. If we ask what has Jesus to do with this? The answer is, so little that we may say nothing. True He lived. But he lived, Kautsky tells us, a rebel, a leader of revolutionary bands of banditti. On one of these raids He was seized, and by Roman magistrates crucified.

Kautsky, forgetting the Passion and almost all the body of Christ's teaching, quotes a few scattered passages in proof of his thought. (Luke 22:36 and Christ before Pilate).

The positions of Kautsky are really answered involuntarily. They break down of their own weight. His ground is only possible by his using the New Testament utterly without regard to any rules of critical thought. He arbitrarily includes and excludes its sections and books and paragraphs with no other pur-

pose than that of proving his premises. His plan therefore is absolutely without any claim to those who have regard for honest research. He excludes Paul's writings entirely, for they show the Christian life in relation to a legitimate government. But the revolutionary procedure of the zealots among the Jews was maintained up to the time of Hadrian, while Christians had been taught by their scriptures to live during all this time in peace with the State.⁹

Further, it is utterly inexplicable how a mere revolutionary teacher, such as Kautsky makes out Jesus to be, after He has been captured and executed, should continue to have such momentous force, such exhilarating influence as Jesus must have had. How could an unsuccessful leader become the head of a great movement, and how could any leader of so little and unimportant a body of men as the Zealots were obtain a commanding influence, first among Jewish secretaries such as Pharisees by whom they were bitterly antagonized, and then by the Gentile world, who knew little and cared less about all these external Jewish dissensions.

Moreover, there is utter failure to account for Christianity in that crucial point when the leader is crucified and as a consequence his followers disheartened. Here is a bridgeless chasm for the Kautsky school, and in the perplexity of it they are helpless.

With Kalthoff¹⁰ we come to another socialistic view of a more extreme type, and yet one with much ground in common with those previously mentioned (i. e., of Maurnbrecher and Kautsky.) Like them he founds his conception of Jesus on the social idea. Indeed among recent writers he may be said to be the originator of this social interpretation of Jesus' life. On the other hand to him the Jesus of the New Testament has no existence. Him whom we know, in Whom we have believed, Him Kalthoff cannot find. He has finally reached the bottom.

Christianity was according to this view "purely a collective movement of the masses," entirely apart from the individualistic ideals of to-day's Christianity. Communistic as it was, the very

⁹ Windisch, *Jesus ein Rebel?* Neue Zeit., No. 28, Bk. I.

¹⁰ Das Christus Problem, Grundlinien zur Socialtheologie, 1903. Die Entstehung des Christentums, 1904. Was Wissen wir von Jesus, 1904.

idea of laying stress on any individual is out of harmony and inconsistent with the historical situation.

"Kalthoff stands on the basis of the so-called materialistic conception of history, whose nature consists in this; that it does not deduce the movements and incidents of a world historic sort from the activities of brilliantly endowed individuals, but rather interprets history from the class struggles of the several strata of society."¹¹

But however much modern ideas tend towards the full recognition of society and social forces in the interpretation of the past, yet at the same time there never dares be denial of the existence of epoch making personalities nor a negation of their great weight in shaping history both religious and civil.

Therefore Kalthoff must build his denial of Jesus upon a more substantial basis than that of merely emphasizing the social structure at the expense of the individual. This he seeks to do, in a way perfectly consistent with, but at the same time to the despair of the average liberal school of theology. As a liberal, he too refuses credence to the New Testament writings upon which we base our picture of Christ. This he does not in part like most liberals—but in toto or just as far as necessary to carry out his own conception or to color the figure of Jesus according to his own taste. Since some of the Pauline letters have been by his liberal predecessors counted invalid, he deftly but valiantly brushes them all aside, thus carrying the liberal premises to their logical conclusion with a vengeance. His methods of work, applied to history, would deny the reality of such a man as Francis of Assisi of whom shortly after his death we have narratives of wonder works and fanciful miracles. Yet these do not affect our certainty as to Francis' existence.

He maintains also that John's Gospel is full of the ideas of New Platonism, a philosophic tendency of the third century after Christ. He forgets among other things that Irenaeus, who wrote about 180 his great work (*Adversus Haeresias*) against heresies, knows and uses John's Gospel very largely.¹² But like Haeckel, Kalthoff is not bothered by a little thing like historical accuracy.

11 Prof. Walter, Breslau, *Christentum ohne Christus*.

12 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book 1-5, John 1:1-2. Book 1-5, John 1:14. Book 1-5, John 1:5. Book 1-5, John 1:3-4 and scores of others.

What he is pleased to leave of the New Testament, he interprets allegorically.

Peter is not a person, but the brotherhood of Rome.

Christ is not a person, but the Christian Church brotherhood. All early writings that absolutely necessitate a recognition of Jesus the individual, he simply rejects, as for instance the letters of Ignatius. In such cases as they refer to Jesus he calls the references interpolations. In such cases as he needs Ignatius' help he quotes him with insistence.

But one asks in astonishment how could this idea of Christ utterly apart from any personal Christ have wrought itself into the strong early days of the Church's life, and then, stranger yet, having been inwrought how did the Church change to its idea of the personal Christ—and all the time no one know of it—no hue and cry be raised about it. No, Kalthoff's ideas are allegory sure enough. He fails in historical, critical interpretation.¹³ (Jeremias).

No merely poetic legendary mythical literature, such as Kalthoff imagines the New Testament to be, can ever possibly meet the needs of a great new religious movement with a force which dominates in a short time the whole world both in the heart and in the State. Jewish Messianism, state philosophy, and social communism do not combine with the fervency necessary to explain a Christianity outside of Christ. So that no more here than at the hand of Kautsky do we find that the social solution of the life of Jesus is adequate to explain the initial strength which inhered in the conquering Christian circles of the very early centuries of the era which we call—and do well to call—the era of Christ.

We now turn from the denial of Jesus on social grounds to that same denial on the grounds of Oriental myth. This view is represented and championed by Prof. Jensen the Assyriologist.¹⁴ Professor Jensen characterizes the work of the Evangelists as merely a Judaistic reconstruction of the sagas of Babylonia. He finds the root of our Gospels specially in the poetic Epic of "Gil-

¹³ Jeremias, *N. T. Zeitschrift*, Feb. 1911.

¹⁴ Peter Christian Albrecht Jensen of Marburg, whose chief work is in Assyriology and Hittite inscriptions. See also Fr. Stendel—"Im Kampf um die Christusmythe," 1910 für die Existenz des Menschen Jesus.

gamesch."¹⁵ This epic, whose text is from the seventh century B. C., was given out by the Assyrian king Sardonapolis. It has been much written about. In it we have the core of Jensen's myth idea, of the origin of Christianity without Christ. Its general content is as follows.¹⁶

The hero of the poem is the demigod Gilgamesch. He is three-fourths God, one-fourth man. As a ruler, he is Lord of the city of Erech and despotic in the exercise of his power. He builds for protection a wall about his city and in so doing compels the young men of the town to toil like serfs. Their wives and sweethearts grieve at this and beg the Goddess Aruru, while Gilgamesch's attention is elsewhere directed, to create other beings of power and nature equal to his. This she does, making Eabini out of the earth.

Eabini has long shaggy hair, and at first refuses association with men—remaining with the animals. He lives on grass and herbs, a wilderness life. In the meantime he is enticed by a bashful maiden to come with her into the city. Thereafter the animals fear him and shun him and flee before him. But already Gilgamesch has seen in dreams, now of a star, again of a man, the Host of the Lord, who is stronger than he. These dreams presage the coming of Eabini. Thereupon Eabini enters the city and Gilgamesch and he become friends. Then occasions arise calling for a series of heroic fabled acts, like those of Achilles or Hercules if you please. (First) they make a crusade against the Tyrant Chumbales whose task it has been to protect the forest of cedar—the home of the gods. They bring Chumbales' head back to Erech a trophy of victory. According to the epic, Eabini seems now to return to the forest. Then the Sun God calls to him telling him that his feet will be blessed by the kings of the earth. Eabini leaves the desert, comes again to Gilgamesch, the godless Ischtan loves him but he fears her love because it has wrought sorrow in her former lovers. In her rage she causes a god to create a heavenly dragon who shall conquer the heroes. But again Gilgamesch and Eabini overcome their adversary.

But at this juncture the victorious career of these demigods

15 Die Gilgamesch Epos in der Weltliteratur, 1906, Jensen.

16 See Prof. Walter Breslau—Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung, Christentum ohne Christus, Dec. 2, 1910.

seems to end. Eabini falls into a deep sleep from which he does not again awake. Gilgamesch is in heavy sorrow—first because of the death of his friend and farther because this death seems to impend also over him. He is uncertain of a continued immortality in life. So he seeks for a means to escape this death—and this, how to escape death, is doubtless the purpose and purport of the whole epic.

Gilgamesch seeks help of the Xisuthros, from whom he learns that he has attained immortal life in that he is to be translated among the gods. But though translated he yet must divinely attain the height by his own efforts. The way thereto is not a light or easy one. It is full of dangers and snares. Gilgamesch meets first the scorpion man, part man, part dragon. It guards the gateway to the sun. The dragon will not permit Gilgamesch's passage, yet he wins his way through. He comes to the Goddess Siduri and asks the further way's direction. She tells him of a boatman who can bring him there, but at the same time informs him that he cannot attain thereto, cannot reach his desire for the gods have decreed it that the fate of man is death. Yet Gilgamesch with his boatman sails to escape this death—from east to west, till he comes to the very waters of death itself. In the breakers and roaring surf Gilgamesch tears the mast out of the boat to save himself.

Again he comes to Xisuthros and begs for knowledge of how he may attain immortality. But Xisuthros too tells him it has been appointed man once to die. He, however, inquires of Xisuthros how he, Xisuthros, has attained immortality. Then it is that Xisuthros tells him the Babylonian story of the flood. The gods had determined to obliterate man altogether, but he had built a ship for himself and saved himself, family and the beasts.

The gods, sorry for their action, glad that life had escaped, showed their gratitude to Xisuthros by setting him among the gods. But yet that does not help Gilgamesch. Xisuthros tells him to find a certain bitter weed which would enable him to reach home safely, but a serpent robs him of it. Saddened, at last Gilgamesch finds himself again, still under the fear of death, at his home city of Erech. And the epic ends by Gilgamesch, who now sees no deliverance from death, calling up his friend Eabini and inquiring of him of his life in the kingdom of the

dead. Thus it seems that the struggle for life out of death is merged into a plaint over the dead.

In this Babylonian Homeric myth Jensen seeks to find the beginnings of our Gospel of the Son of God. It would surely be pathetic if it were not tragic.

By dint of ingenuity he seeks to find a series of parallels between Epic and Gospel.¹⁷

At first Eabini is created by a miracle. John miraculously announced by an angel.

Eabini is a dweller in the wilderness and has shaggy hair. John Baptist lives in the wilderness and has hair unshorn.

Eabini like the wild beasts lives on herbs and the products of the wild. John on grasshoppers and wild honey.

Gilgamesch has portentous dreams of some one to come stronger than he, which is fulfilled by Eabini's coming to him. John foretells Jesus' coming to him, who must increase as he must decrease and Jesus Himself does appear to him as the Lamb of God.

Eabini and John both flee into the wilderness.

The Sun God from heaven tells Eabini in the desert of better food. The Devil takes Jesus up into the high mountains and speaks to Him of bread "from these stones."

There are further parallels, but this is sufficient to indicate Jensen's supposed Gospel origin. He also indicates a sort of similarity between Xisuthuros and Jesus in connection with a kind of parallelism in Xisuthuros' life to the episode of the stilling of the tempest in the Sea of Galilee.¹⁸

Here then is this old Babylonish seventh century B. C. legend Jensen seeks for clay to make gospel brick. Let it be said at once he is making brick without straw.

Now if we take up these supposed parallelisms and examine them critically it is only to see them disappear.

There is lamentable confusion in the personal parallelism. Jesus is now Eabini and then He is Xisuthuros. John is first Eabini, then he becomes Gilgamesch, later suffering under Herod he dies as Eabini.

Take the uncited parallel of the stilling of the tempest and its

17 P. Jensen—Moses, Jesus, Paulus, drei Varianten des Babylonischen Gottmenschen-Gilgamesch, 1909, pages 27-30.

18 P. Jensen—Moses, Paulus, und Jesus"—pages 29 and 30.

following incidents, Jesus is Gilgamesch and Xisuthuros absolutely without rule or order.

Gilgamesch again in different parts of this story represents the rich man in hell, and the rich young ruler, the disciples, Peter and Christ. Thus confusion and confusion only, comes of any attempt to follow any parallelism with regard to the persons of the epos.

Now turning from persons to events, we arrive at a confusion worse confounded in pursuing the alleged parallelism. John is identified with Eabini because of a supposed likeness to their birth, though otherwise there is not a single inner characteristic in common. Did they both live in the wilderness—yet was this not common in the East and not a thing upon which to base an identification any more than nowadays it would be a mark to identification of two persons to say that they both lived in a brick house. John was a prophet—Eabini anything but that. John reproves Herod for Herodias' sake—Gilgamesch, who here takes the place of Eabini, reproves the Goddess Ischtus. How utterly absurd is the comparison drawn.

Take the case of the temptation parallelism. With Jesus there is the turning aside from the lesser good that He may consecrate the higher motive—His bread and meat is to do the will of Him who sent Him. But as for Eabini when his temptation comes, he is one with the beasts and lured by a common woman sent to tempt him, he follows her into the city—yielding to the lower nature.

These utter inconsistencies, Jensen himself is obliged to recognize but with the irrevocableness of the man whose mind is made up he tries to find his way out by claiming that the Gilgamesch epic is just the starting point and source of the Gospel story of Christ and also of the Old Testament narratives. Everywhere he finds two characters like Abraham and God, Moses and Aaron, Elijah and Elisha. And wherever two names are together he is quite excited over a re-discovery of his friends Gilgamesch and Eabini. So where there are discrepancies he simply says time has got the sharp personal elements of Gilgamesch and Eabini mixed. It is as though Gilgamesch has acquired an eye of Eabini, a tooth of Xisuthuros. And Eabini has won the ability to be now Gilgamesch, now Xisuthuros, now both. (You recall the strange case of Mr. Jekyl and Dr. Hyde). In view of these ab-

surditities, students of Jensen's scheme agree that he fails in consistently carrying through the Gilgamesch epic, any Gospel character or event at all. There is no logical sequence or consequential order of the Gospel narratives and the Gilgamesch epic. It is just because there is no organic relation that Jensen has to make out his character a Jesus by combining three or four of his mythical persons into one in order to come any way within the scope of reason near to the Gospel story. But can we not see that by such a process we can prove that Jesus was Gilgamesch or Eabini or Xisuthuros at our pleasure, and that which proves too much, as logicians tell us proves nothing at all. I am sure therefore that we dare say that Jensen's house is a house of cards.

Besides this—and even beyond it in fatality to Jensen's case, in order to make any sort of case at all he has to make huge gaps in both Gospel and Epic, in forming his parallelism. He identified the two only by the happy and hardy expedient of dropping out always and anywhere, characteristics not desired and which might be awkward. Jesus, as we know Him, is not in the Babylonian tale, at all. None of his teachings, none of his unified oneness with God, none of his spiritual heights, is there.

How about Gilgamesch's effort to overcome death? The purpose of the epic. There is no answer—but submission. The Greek stoics answer, that is all. In the Gilgamesch epic as we have it there is no resurrection. The hinge of Christian history is thus absent. The parallelisms, whatever they may seem to be, have no core, no objective purpose, no centrality of motive, no consequential organic oneness, that which is the heart and soul of Christianity is not in Jensen's myth at all. Hence we register here a colossal failure. In no respect does Jensen's hypothesis as a theory to explain the origin of the Gospel without reference to a historical Jesus, seem to have any validity.¹⁹ We may pass from Jensen by the assertion that the origin of Christianity is not to be understood as a mere solution of a historical problem.

We advance now and finally to the man who most of all has in the past months been in the public eye when the life of Jesus Christ has been under consideration. This man is Arthur Drews,

¹⁹ Case—*American Journal of Theology*, Jan. 1911.

a professor of philosophy in the technical Hochschule at Karlsruhe.²⁰

It was more than anyone else's, his denial of Jesus Christ that moved the passionate popular assemblages held last summer all over Germany in which the Christian populace, of all shades of theological view, poured out a flood of undreamed of enthusiasm in testimonial to their unchanged and unchanging faith in the life of Jesus Christ and the life to come made possible only by Him.

Like Kalthoff, he refuses to accept Jesus Christ as a historical character. But his grounds are not sociological, but literary-historical. In this he is more on Jensen's ground.

He belongs to the "religionsgeschichtliche school" whose purpose in recent years has been to show that Christianity like other religions had its origin as a natural development, entirely within the range of the ordinary processes of growth and life. Christianity is thus a religion, that is one made up of an admixture of Jewish and Oriental elements.

Drews, simply following out this line of argument, takes a step in advance—a step which his predecessors were either not willing or not able to do. He does not permit the mythical idea to enter into his argument merely as an incidental support. But he makes it the very center of his viewpoint. He however gets his myth from the Jews rather than the Orient.

In brief, he declares that very early, before New Testament times, there was among Jewish sects a so-called Jesus-God and cult reaching as far back as Joshua of the Old Testament, and to this in the making of the Jesus of the Gospels there is added Jewish apocalyptic and heathen myth ideas.

The gospels thus do not contain the history of an actual person, but are merely the narrative of a myth—a Jesus made up out of Old Testament prophets and from variously wrought in and wrought out mythical conceptions. Paul himself, who is the pre-eminent witness for Christianity, really knows nothing of an historical Jesus. The incarnate God of whom he spoke is merely this Jewish-Oriental cult-god etherealized and ethicised by Paul himself. The elements which gathered about this Jesus in the early Christian community, such as Baptism and the

²⁰ Die Christus Myths, 3d ed. 1910. Hat Jesus gelebt, Berliner Religionsgespräch 1910.

Lord's Supper, the crucifixion and the resurrection are all, according to this view, from pre-Christian symbolism.²¹

In the first chapter of his book on "Der Vorchristliche Jesus," that is the Jesus who was before the Jesus of the gospels, Christ is made out to be the cult-god of an early Jewish sect. And we have the bald assertion that before our era, that is before Christ, there were Jesus worshippers. This is a daring statement. One would think the proof would be specially strong. But what we have is not a rich clover field of fact, but a sparse and struggling growth with here and there a dirty, toughened, tooth-worn blade. Let us see. We find three exhibits offered in evidence for this early use of the name "Jesus."

These are extracts respectively from Hippolytus,²² Epiphanius and from an early Paris magic papyrus.

Hippolytus in the beginning of the third century A. D., quotes a hymn²³ of the "Nassini" which seeks to explain their gnostic system. In this hymn we have a line, "But Jesus said, Father, behold, a strife of ills across the earth. On this account, oh Father, send me....and secrets of the saintly faith, styled 'gnosis,' I'll impart." Drews claims this reference as probably pre-Christian.

But first "The Philosophumes or Refutations of Heresies" was only discovered in 1842 at Mt. Athos—men are not yet certain even that it is by Hippolytus. Some say Origen is the author. "The text of the hymn quoted is very corrupt."²⁴ Besides Hippolytus cites this "Nassini" sect as a Christian sect, and it is the nature of so-called Christian gnostics that "they use old Babylonian mythologies and apply them to the historical person of Jesus, thus taking ancient pre-Christian myths and fitting them into the lives of the persons who are known through the New Testament."²⁵

In the matter of the Paris Papyrus of magic Drews quotes two passages, the second and chief of which reads: "ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ

21 Berliner Religionsgespräch, Hat Jesus gelebt, 1910.

22 Realencyclopædie, Vol. 14, article Ophiten—R. Liechtenhahn. See page 410 die Erlösung.

23 Hippolytus Refutation of Heresies, Book V, Chapt. 5.

24 Bunsen, I, 36.

25 Windnisch, der Geschichtliche Jesus, p. 166, Th. R. March 1910.

του θεου των Εβραίων Ιησου, "²⁶ (I put you on oath by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus).

Now is this formula pre-Christian? It seems absolutely without question not to be. This is the opinion of both Harnack and Windisch neither of whom can be accused of shying from any negative results which their acceptance of the early age of this wonder-working magic document might demand.

The fragment from which the lines are taken is preserved in the Bibliothque National in Paris and was written about the third century,²⁷ that is at a post-Christian date and under Christian influences.²⁸ This fragment gives us an illustration of the books of magic with which Paul met at Ephesus. It is after Paul's time and contains anti-Christian spells and sorceries with an admixture of Christian thoughts and ideas.²⁹

The name of Jesus is thus, according to every probability, dragged into an old magic formula to give it special strength. So it is a recognition of the growing power of Christ in the early Church. (Remember the case of Elymas and Simon the Sorcerer). "The name of Jesus in this fragment," says Deissmann, "dare scarcely be considered old. It is apparently introduced by a heathen. Neither a Christian nor certainly a Jew would call Jesus the God of the Hebrews."³⁰

The conclusion borne out by the examination is that it is a heathen formula of dubious date in regard to its magical part, but itself written down in its present form not earlier than the third century. It is on such slender threads as these that decision is sought for so stupendous a reversal of history.

Special weight is attached by Drews to his other proof, that from Epiphanius, the church father who lived in the fourth century. Epiphanius speaks of a sect called *Ιεσοῖται* that this sect afterwards took the name *Ναζοῖται* but that this earlier name is to be derived from "Jesus" and that this sect existed long before Christ.³¹ Now first Epiphanius seems doubtful as to who these *Ιεσοῖται* really were, identifying them now with the Therapeutae of Philo and again with the false Christians. But in neither

²⁶ Lines 3019-20, Book II, Quoted by Deissmann.

²⁷ Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, page 180.

²⁸ Windisch, *der Geschichliche Jesus*, p. 186, March 1910 Th. R.

²⁹ Deissmann.

³⁰ Deissmann, page 186, Note 14.

³¹ Epiphanius *Haereceis*, 29-6.

case do we find a pre-Christian Jesus cult. For, in the first place, the name *Ιεσσαίοι* is to be derived not from *Ἰησους* but from *Ιεσσαί*.³² Secondly, the Nazaraioi or Nasarioi can only be connected with the Christians by a dubious philological process, as for instance that Nazarite-watchman-keeper-Savior-Jesus. But Epiphanius makes no such statement. In fact he himself attaches the name Nazarite to the village of Nazareth, which early and uniform tradition makes the home of Jesus. And Epiphanius distinguishes between two forms of the word Nazarine. When sifted down, what he really says is this—"that the known Jewish Christian sect, the *Ναζωραίοι* called themselves originally *Ιεσσαίοι* before the name Christian was taken up;" but that the *Ιεσσαίοι* were consequently before the time of Christ, Epiphanius does not at all affirm. What he does say is this, that another sect than the above-named *Ναζωραίοι* called themselves *Ναζαπαίοι* and that these existed already before Christ."³³ With this distinction Epiphanius really says quite the reverse of what Drews tries to read into him.

Third, a further proof that the two preceding deductions I have just made are correct, that is that Epiphanius does not affirm nor intend to affirm a Jesus cult antedating the Jesus of the Gospels, is this: as a Christian he evidently could not have taken such a position annihilating all his work, specially as he was characterized by the strictest orthodoxy and the most earnest piety.³⁴

Thus a careful insight into these three pieces of documentary evidences—all the positive and direct proof which Drews presents—shows their utter inadequacy to make his case. His thesis so far as this his direct evidence is concerned thus breaks down completely.

There is also, however, other circumstantial evidence alleged which we will do well to look into. Assumptions drawn from the hazy and gauzy mists of the past and clad in the grotesque and sportive forms of his own inventive ecstatic and superexuberant fancy. Let us see!

It is supposed that along with the stern monotheism of the

³² Windisch, *Der Geschicht Jesus*, Tr. R. p. 166.

³³ *Christentum ohne Christus*—Walter Breslau—*Allg. Kirch. Zeitung*, Dec. 16, 1910.

³⁴ Epiphanius, art. *Realencyklopedie*, Bonwetch, vol. 5, p. 418.

main tribes of the Jews there were in existence Jewish sects who at the same time worshipped a pre-gospel Jesus. This Jesus cult was gradually introduced and built up from Greek and Oriental religious influence which had gradually penetrated the hard shell of Hebrew faith and custom.

In answer to this it may be said at once that isolation is one of the very fundamentals of Jewish religious history. Whatever else may be said of them, it remains that the Hebrews carried a persistent, stubborn and growing aloofness from Polytheism and adherence to Monotheism. "The Lord their God is one God"—so not only does the whole trend and color of Jewish history give no basis for this supposed existing Jesus cult, but when carefully examined the definite testimony for such cult is as usual most hazy and unsatisfactory. Jewish literature is silent about any such thing. It is unaware of the Jesus cult.

Indeed Drews only instances one or two such sects, though he claims them to have been "numberless." The name "Jesus" is connected for instance with the *θεραπευτης* mentioned by Philo, because forsooth—*θεραπευτης* means leader—while Jesus is deliverer, savior. It is in this sort of way the Therapeutae are shown to be Jesus worshippers. The wish is father to the thought.

Typical of this is the method of handling the Symbol of the Lord. The Gospel "Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world" is presumptuously identified with Arios (the bull). Agnus Dei, Lamb of God, originally was but Agnus Deus, the Lamb-God.³⁵ Drews fails entirely to note that Agnus Dei is a mere translation of the original Greek *ἀμνος του θεου*. But there is no relation at all between Agni, a cult, i. e., Agni the proper name, and *ἀμνος* from which our Agnus comes, simply because it is the translation of *ἀμνος*—not the transliteration.

Joseph and Mary are treated in similar mythical way. Joseph is a carpenter that is an artificer like Kinyrac the father of Adonis and Vulcan the father of Mercury.³⁶ Mary is merged in a similar way into Maya the mother or Agnis or Mihe the mother of Mithris or Maya the mother of Adonis. As you will understand no proof is given or attempted for such bold recon-

35 *Christus Myth*, pages 99-103.

36 *Christus Myth*, page 75.

structions—nothing but the cleverness of the surmise which, clearly subjective, is supposed to have convincing force.

In this working out of history into mythical cult, John Baptist is denied as a historical personality and of course his preaching and baptism in the wilderness of Judea vanishes as a dream. True Josephus has a very minute, interesting and for his purpose pertinent notice of "John that was called the Baptist" and "who was sent a prisoner out of Herod's suspicious temper to Maechaerus, the castle I have before mentioned, and was there put to death."³⁷ Drews simply sets the passage aside denying its authenticity. Why? Not because there is any such evidence, but because according to his theory it must not be there.

John Baptist is only the Babylonian god Oannes. Yet even the liberal critical theologians have to deny such high-handed putting away of John Baptist. For aside from Josephus, the whole New Testament incidental later narratives of John shows him not to have been an invention but out of a real segment of Jewish life.

As illustration take the (Luke 7:18) disciples of John visiting Jesus, his answer, their struggles, John's own self-obliteration. All are incidents which in no wise at the time were helps to a popular acceptance of the work of Jesus—incidents which therefore are there because they are historical—and are not therefore to be eliminated.

Coming now to Jesus' suffering and death on the cross, Drews merges these gospel facts with supposed extra-canonical similar ideas, until the gospel fact of the cross, "If I be lifted up will draw all men unto me," is totally submerged in its mythical pre-Christian correlates. It is argued that the Suffering Messiah is not an exclusively Christian idea, but was Jewish already previously and of heathen origin; and that the cross before Christianity had found its religious symbolization as the way of the martyr.³⁸

Now that nature myths of death and resurrection, typifying winter and summer, are characteristics of the Orient and even of Greek thought no one questions. But that these geographically isolated and ethically strange and religiously divergent local

³⁷ Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 18, Chapt. 5:2.

³⁸ *Christus Myth*, pages 103 ff.

nature myths could without any other centralizing force have become the dominant, central, focal, masterful force of Christianity which it has become, is unthinkable to anyone who balances his judgment by just scales and weights.

The early disciples did not expect Jesus' death, least of all on the cross. They had to be told it again and again³⁹ and were dull in the hearing and dazed in their experience of it.⁴⁰ They were totally unlike in their reticence and unbelief to those whom Drews tells us of, who elected the heathen ideals to put them together in the person of Jesus. Mark, Matthew, Luke or John give no pictures at all like his of the faith of these disciples. And as for the cross, it later true enough became the Christian's sign of triumph. (*In hoc signo vinces.* Constantine.) But it was at first an offense, to Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. Perhaps it had application in other religious symbols, but this has nothing at all to do with disallowing the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. It would be quite as absurd to deny the recent coronation of George V of England because of doubt as to the historical genuineness of the ancient black stone in the old wooden chair on which the kings of England sit when crowned, because one cannot prove that this stone was really, as the legend has it, the very stone used by Jacob for a pillow when in Padan Aram he dreamed and wrestled with God. In short, whatever history duly examined into may tell us as to the pre-Christian reverential use of the cross, it can tell us nothing to eliminate the cross of Christ as a fact first of Jerusalem history and only afterwards of religious power and conquest.

The name "Jesus" itself is exploited by Drews in an effort to show a pre-Christian prototype. We have shown his method before, a method of pure fancifulness without scientific basis. He lets his imagination run riot with all the possible similarities of sounds in the various languages.

Jesus is thus Joshua. Both names are alike in sound and meaning. Joshua a cult god leads his people to the land of milk and honey, equals the Milky Way. Jesus and Joshua are equivalent to the Greek Jason. Jesus has His twelve disciples, Joshua his twelve tribes, and Jason his twelve eunuchs, all these were

³⁹ Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32.

⁴⁰ Luke 24:25.

different idealizations of the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Isn't this argument with a vengeance? For of course there is no whit of evidence of a Joshua-cult among the early tribes, and the names Joshua, Jason, Jesus were so common that Josephus himself refers to not less than twenty persons called Jesus.⁴¹ One might really just as logically relate all the 'Hans' in Deutschland with all the Hansens in Norway, or if you please affirm that President Lincoln was a Jew and Mr. Roosevelt a Greek, for wasn't the former's name Abraham, and that of the latter Theodore?

With this sort of reasoning, or rather lack of it, one gets nowhere at all. And one is not surprised that numbers of Prof. Drews' compatriots refer quite often to the fact that he is no "fachman" in much of the ground he covers. That he has no skilled knowledge of that which he affirms.⁴²

In the meantime how does Drews handle the Gospels. Briefly speaking and characteristically, one can say he sets the Gospels very lightly aside. He claims them all fictions. He calls the effort to critically determine their content a "horrible fiasco." To tell the truth he gives quite a shock to the liberals by taking their own positions, quoting their own arguments and then showing how logic leads to shooting the rapids and even going over the whirlpool.

But the whole liberal camp are shocked at this bold use of their weapons—and I incline to think some of them will waken up to the perilous place they hold.

Windisch, Wernle,⁴³ Holtzmann,⁴⁴ Julicher,⁴⁵ Von Soden,⁴⁶ Weiss⁴⁷ and Weinel⁴⁸ all deny with scorn that liberalism leads to any such conclusions. And perhaps they are right. Yet Drews uses their concessions without mercy and often draws blood. Though to be sure not gospel blood.

To illustrate, Windisch, a liberal, but reverential and who can ill brook the destructive work of Drews, must agree that there

41 Weinel—Ist das Liberale Jesusbild widerligt, 1911.

42 He is prof. of philosophy in Karlsruhe.

43 P. Wernle—Wider Modern Skepsis für der Glauben an Jesus.

44 H. Holtzmann—Paulus als zeuge wider die Christusmyth.

45 A. Julicher—Hat Jesus gelebt.

46 H. Von Soden—Hat Jesus gelebt.

47 J. Weiss—Jesus Von Nazareth, Mythos oder Geschichte.

48 Ist das liberale Jesusbild Widerligt—H. Weinel.

are legendary sections in the New Testament, but he draws the line on Drews' calling these "really numberless." Thus between Drews and these men there has arisen considerable heat. For the first time some of them have been brought to a sudden and heretofore undreamed of consciousness of the fateful if not fated possibilities of their position.

To be sure Drews has handled the gospel texts with perfect naivete and utter disregard to a real scholarly understanding of the text. Yet the philologist Wendland declares that "whoever is not able to find individual religious life in the Synoptic basis, he is incompetent of historical research in this province."⁴⁹ And Windisch insists that in all the philological points Drews tries to make against Christ "not a single ground has been found against the historicity of Jesus." "We have no ground to mistrust the Evangelical tradition in this way."⁵⁰

But to Drews the Gospels contain only the myth of the God-Man Jesus, wrapped up in historical forms taken from Old Testament prophets and also heathen contemporaneous cults. To this is added poem and legend. This is his picture. Setting aside the text, Drews has ready to replace it a theory as wild as it is baseless: Paul has already become a power with his new teaching. The Jewish-Christian Adonis worshippers grow jealous of his success, specially his freedom from the law. To meet and rival him and vanquish him, they determine to show he doesn't know Jesus at all. Hence they build up a new Jesus Christ, personifying an ideal and attaching to it all sorts of legend and poem. And this is how we get Jesus.

This requires no rejoinder. It falls of its own weight over against "In the beginning was God and the Word was God." So also does Drews' assertion that "In the gospel, we are not dealing with a deified man but rather with an anthropomorphized God."⁵¹ For undoubtedly the chief difficulty of the propagators and missionaries for early Christianity was not an unwillingness or disinclination to believe that a God could or had become man (See Warneck), but that a man, as they thought like others whose brethren they knew, whose reputed father was a neighbor of theirs, that such an one—could be—was God, that the Jew,

49 Quoted by Walter Breslau, *Allg. Zeitung*, Dec. 16, 1910.

50 *Theo.* May 1910, p. 178.

51 *Christus Mythe*, p. 210.

was Son of Man, Son of David and Son of God.⁵² At least this is the natural process of the growth of Christianity in its very feeble beginnings. It works out from the active person of Jesus. He compels the slack and tardy acceptance of Himself to grow into fealty and love, sheerly out of what he was and became to the band of disciples and not at all because they expected Him as God.

Paul is handled with the same slight-of-hand and legerdemain as were the Gospels. Paul according to Drews knows no historical Jesus. He is acquainted with no human-factual Jesus, but only with an ideal man, a heavenly god-man by which he means to express only the ideal totality of our humanity's manhood.⁵³

Paul's Jesus was merely the God of a heathen cult. The matter of the last supper (I Cor. 11:23) is set aside as an early interpolation; the appearances of the resurrected Christ become a mere ecstatic experience, (I Cor. 15:3). The "brothers" of the Lord (Gal. 1:19) are not kin but the expression of a new fraternal relationship. The "Words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 20:35) are personifications only.

Yet though he denies the validity of all these for him unhandy passages, he yet builds a whole theology out of Paul's teaching and life, using such parts as suit his theory. In this picking and choosing there is no rule nor principle by which he accepts the one and rejects the other. It is all a matter of individual choice and taste, with not even the gravity of our childhood methods of determining our future riches or profession by the process of naming our buttons "rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief." So we learn that Paul has no occasion for nor real interest in the life of Jesus. His doctrine depends upon the so-called heavenly Christ on whom he believed before he believed on Jesus (the cult Jesus) and on whom and not on the real Jesus he built his Christ-mythology.

If we ask how Paul's gospel was born, or rather how he was born into it, we are told that Adonis is the basis of it. We know from our Greek mythology how Adonis, beloved by Aphrodite, died of a wound. From his blood sprang the Anemone. Aphrodite's

⁵² See American Journal of Theology, Jan. 1911, art. Historicity of Jesus. S. J. Case.

⁵³ Christumythe, p. 143.

grief was so great that the gods of the lower world permitted him to spend six months of each year with her on the earth. So sprang up the Adonis worship of Phoenician origin and in all probability associated with the idea of the revival of nature after the death of the winter.

Tarsus was a metropolitan education center. Here Paul learned of this Adonis cult which had in the meantime been worked over by some Jews, and spiritualized and incorporated into Jewish thought.

First in Antioch, (Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch) the effort was made to introduce this new worship. Paul first opposed it. Then suddenly it came to him that this Adonis idea represented the Messiah, who was therefore their Lord. The resurrection idea was thus ready at hand. Could it not be, thought Paul, that the Messiah whom the Jews expected on the ground of human righteousness had already come and won salvation for men. This idea he grasped through the Adonis myth and Hebrew prophecy and once having this thought Christianity was born and the myth might go.

Surely it is bizarre enough, this new basis for Paul and Christ and Christianity. One would think Paul would tell us something of this Adonis cult, something of how the idea sprang into his mind, who was this Messiah, when and how did he appear, how did he accomplish the redemption. Yet we who read Paul's letters find nothing of all this. To refresh my mind as to Adonis, I have to turn to a classic mythology, not to a concordance of the New Testament.

How can such unheard of conceptions be the occasion of Christianity? Here is a deeply religious Jew Paul, he is angered at the Jewish heathenish myth, but all at once he adopts it with enthusiasm, the holy Messiah, the divine promise of the prophets comes, has come in the type of a heathen legend. He, keen, cultured religionist, accepts without a question. He gives his life to an hallucination. He tells his fellow-countrymen our Messiah is come. Of course not really but just the idea. If this is anything, this is Plato and not Paul. It may be the Platonic idea, it is not the "I know whom I have believed" of Paul.

But Paul does know Christ. There is no time to discuss this feature here. Recent discussion fully satisfied the unity of Jesus Christ and Paul. It is no longer an open question whether or

not Paul is true to the life and teaching of Christ. Recent works both exact and scholarly have set forever at rest the supposed alienation of Paul and Christ. Knowling,⁵⁴ Weiss,⁵⁵ Julicher⁵⁶ and Kaftan have demonstrated without possibilities of contradiction that the Apostle Paul preached and lived in the transcendental Christ, because he knew and understood the Jesus of Judea and Man of Galilee.

Paul's pre-existent Son of God has personal characteristics which can be derived neither from Greek mythology nor from the Logos idea of Philo, but which have their origin out of the historical portrait of the Gospels."⁵⁷

Many features of Paul's Christ, such as his poverty,⁵⁸ his disciples,⁵⁹ his exaltation,⁶⁰ have no counterpart at all in the Adonis fiction. And on the other hand many Adonis features find no parallel in the life of Jesus. These lacks of similarity helps us see the absurdity of the assumptions.

The death of Christ is central with Paul. It is the accentuated thing—we preach Christ and Him crucified. And this, as a historical event. This God as a fact and not an idea is the very ground of Paul's new faith, and activity.

Drews fails here to catch the distinction between Jewish and Greek thinking. Philosophical speculation in the abstract is the characteristic of Greek thought, but the Jew on the contrary works out all his prophecy and philosophy as far as he has philosophy in connection with a personality of history.⁶¹

No, we cannot make over Paul, the stern monotheist, into a Greek pantheist, even at the will of a Carlsruhe professor. So we are brought to the fixed conclusion, as far as Paul is concerned, that when a Jew brought the message, the Messiah is come, he must have had a historical person in whom this his faith was grounded. The historical Jesus played the greatest possible role with Paul. In His life and His death were the

54 *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*—R. J. Knowling, 1908.

55 *Paulus und Jesus*—J. Weiss, 1909.

56 *Paulus und Jesus*—A. Julicher, 1907.

57 *Paulus und Jesus*—Weiss, p. 15.

58 2 Cor. 8:9.

59 Gal. 1:18.

60 Phil. 2:9.

61 Windisch—*Theol. May* 1910, p. 172.

begetters of the faith. This was the Messiah, He is called Jesus, was crucified because He must heal the sins of men.⁶²

So that all in all Drews' Christusmyth seems itself a myth, that is a study by one who was not equipped to do what he purposed to do, and who has not done it. Prof. Gunkel says that whoever uses Old Testament citations as does Drews is lacking in the fundamentals. "The comparisons of the names Jesus and Joshua, he continues, which build a marked feature of Drews' system is sheer nonsense. The word Jesus contains a confession of the worship of Jehovah and is not the name of a cult god Joshua. You talk, Prof. Drews, about things you do not understand. Joshua was no cult god, nor was Jesus. The whole older Christianity believed on Jesus. It is high time for you, Prof. Drews, to about face and permit yourself to be taught by men who have learned."⁶³ These were sharp words of Gunkel—but they seem to have been deservedly applied.

Now let us note the grounds which of necessity demand an acknowledgement of the historical person of Jesus.

We may pass by with a mere mention, the reference of Suetonius, private secretary of Hadrian (about 120 A. D.) in his biography of the Emperor Claudius, the reference of Tacitus (A. D. 110)⁶⁴ who speaks of "Christ who under the Emperor Tiberius was executed by Pontius Pilate." I pass by the references to Christ in Josephus⁶⁵ at least one of which bears strong marks of authenticity. Justin Martyr (160) in his dialog with Trypho the Jew enters into an involved and discursive discussion of Christ. But of the Jews one does not expect much mention of Jesus, because of their previous censorship of all things Christian. There are also inscriptions at Pompeii pointing to Jesus. In fact Jew and Gentile alike take His person for granted. How did Paul imbibe his enthusiastic faith? Surely not from his own hallucination, but from the facts of Jesus' life and death, and most glorious resurrection.

In the beginning some Jewish Christians denied Paul's apostolicity—why? Because he was not eye-witness of the life of

62 Windisch—Theol. May 1910, p. 175.

63 Prof. D. Gunkel— at the Darmstadt Monistenbund Besprechung, Allg. Zeitung, April 29, 1910.

64 *Annales*, 15, 44.

65 *Antiquities* 18-3-3. See also Schürer Part I, Vol. 2, *Antiq.* 20-9-1.

Jesus. Now if they had simply invented Jesus, how easily Paul could have turned the tables on them, and he would have done it too, just as he withstood Peter to his face. He would have called them, and rightly so, deceivers and liars. For they objected to him because he had not seen a person who existed only in their imaginations.

On the contrary, he too, claims to have seen Him "who was the first born of many brethren." And this makes his consistent claim to the Apostolate. But did they really deceive him and all the world, these poor unlettered Jews. For shortly we find him too, speaking not only of the exalted Christ but plainly declaiming on the facts of His earthly life (Rom. 1:3, 3:25, 8:3, I Cor. 15:4, II Cor. 8:9, Gal. 4:4, Phil. 2:3, Col. 1:14) and that he knew of this life more than his epistles narrate is plain (I Cor. 11:23).

The idea of Christ, the ideal Jesus that Drews speaks of so much, Him all devout Jews believed in. They waited the consolation of Israel. But, the crux of the whole matter of early Christianity was, Is this He? Whom say men that I am? Paul as Saul accepted the Messiah idea. But Saul became Paul because he accepted the Messiah fact, the Jesus of Damascus as the Jesus of Bethlehem.

Further the strong and able critical examination of our New Testament text by the most competent scholars, men, many of whom were not prejudiced in its historical favor, warrants beyond a shadow of doubt that text as a whole. "The great mass of the early traditions," says Windisch, liberal, "of the teaching, healing, explaining, reprimanding, reforming, persecuted, hated, condemned and crucified Jesus has nothing whatever to do with myth."⁶⁶

Yet to make his view possible Drews must set absolutely aside the Gospel and Epistle narrative. Like Bauer⁶⁷ he replaces history and its facts by sheer phantasy. Yet illogically he retains the figures of Paul and Peter for his own purposes, characters which by the following out of his own methods would themselves have to be dissolved in thin mist. Besides, if even proof were at hand that here and there a shadow of doubt fell across the narrative, that does not touch the figure of Jesus. The Roman Em-

⁶⁶ Th. Rundschan, page 181, May 1910.

⁶⁷ A. Jeremias—*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Feb. 1911, p. 162.

perors do not disappear from history even though we are not quite certain that they were not the demigods which their successors insisted they were. The fact of Jesus is in no wise touched by the keenest of critical thought.

In this defense liberal theology plays a rather poor role. It is handicapped by its own positions and admissions. It follows an idealistic humanistic philosophy which bases history on "heroes."

If Jesus is a human teacher, he might truly have given an uplift, but how came it about that at once after His death He became the object of belief, set at the right hand of God? How did this all come about so quickly? How did the early Christianity get to this high place? If at first Jesus was a poor rabbi and wandering preacher, how was He so soon discovered to be the Christ Jesus of Paul?⁶⁸

But this Christ Jesus He was to the Church. So that the question really is not, as Drews puts it, has Jesus lived, but rather "who is He?" Had Jesus been no person, the polemics against Christianity would have taken quite another turn, its defense another shade.

Drews is a monist, to him there is no need of redemption. Men are self-redemptive.

The simple fact is that for the earliest Christianity, redemption in Jesus Christ stands in the center. And this redemptive feature came into Christianity, not first through Paul and the other Apostles in themselves; these men were but its preachers. They had the authority of their Master behind them from the first. This conclusion, which is as grounded in the early Church as it is in the New Testament, is the carefully considered view of Prof. Ihmels of Leipzig.⁶⁹

The redemptive need was objectified then once in Jesus Christ. He lived. The Gospels and Apostles attested Him who was Jesus, born in Bethlehem in the days of Herod the King. He was in history. He is in the world. Jesus was the subject of which the predicate is Christ. He came unto His own and His own received Him now.

With Westcott—"We look back indeed for a moment upon the

68 R. Grützacher—*Th. R.*, May 1910.

69 Prof. L. Ihmels—*Allg. Zeitung*, Jan. 6, 1911.

long line of witnesses whose works, attest the efficacy of His un-failing presence. And then we look away from all else to Jesus the leader and perfecter of faith."⁷⁰

The effort to dissipate the historical life of Jesus Christ has been an abject failure. The answer of scholarship is the answer of the years, the response which is the echo of the Gospel in Peter's Pentecostal sermon, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by Him in the midst of you, Him being delivered up by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay. This Jesus did God raise up- whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus whom ye crucified."⁷¹

The Church proclaims with solemn acclaim

Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ,
Thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.

⁷⁰ Westcott—*Christus Consummator*, p. 159.

⁷¹ Acts 2:22.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

THE NEW MEASURE MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

BY REV. GEORGE SCHOLL, D.D.

In the consideration of this subject it should be born in mind that in every well-rounded and symmetrically developed Christian life three faculties or phases of our nature have been brought into an evenly balanced and active exercise. A being capable of a religious experience must, first of all, be intelligent. The knowing faculty is, indeed, the only foundation on which a religious experience can be built. If any one thing has been more fully demonstrated than another in the history of Christianity, and especially in the experience of the Church in its efforts to introduce Christianity among a people that were entirely ignorant of its teachings, it is the fact that the first step is to instruct the subject in the fundamental truths or doctrines of religion. The same is true in regard to the child. In every case the beginning is made by instructing the intellect, by developing and enriching the knowing faculty since only an intelligent being is capable of a religious experience.

But this is not enough. We may conceive of one fully instructed in the doctrines of God's Word and yet not being religious in any true sense of the word. He may have thought out and built up a complete system of theology purely as an intellectual exercise as one might work out a logarithmic table, a chemical formula or construct a theory of the universe. The mere knowledge of any truth that enters as a factor into the shaping of life and conduct is not enough. The emotions must be brought to play upon that truth and warm it into life and action. The feelings must be aroused. The heart must be moved. The clear, cold truth must be brought into a state of flux,—set in motion by the warmth of an ardent, passionate love if it is to accomplish its mission of intoning the life and shaping the conduct of him who holds it.

But even this is not enough. We may conceive the case of a mind well stored with truth and the emotional nature aroused

to a high state of ecstasy with no other result than that the individual understands more or less clearly and feels more or less profoundly. And knowing and feeling are such all-important steps in the experience of the individual that they are often taken for the whole of the Christian life instead of as its mere beginnings. And here it is that the willing or doing faculty is to come in and give practical results, completeness of experience, a symmetrical and well-rounded Christian life and character. The intellect, the susceptibility and the will,—the knowing, the feeling and the doing must be brought into proper relation to and proportionate play with and upon each other. It is only by such a combination of faculties and powers that the ideal Christian character is produced.

Aside from the Master Himself, the character and life-work of St. Paul perhaps furnishes the most striking illustration of the proposition with which I have opened this paper,—a proposition which, I believe, all will admit to be logically, psychologically and scripturally correct. A man like Paul, whose intellectual grasp of the great and fundamental truths of revelation,—truths which have to do with the origin, being, mission and destiny of man, is of such a character that he has been pronounced, next to the Master, the author of our system of Christian theology; a man who was so swayed by his emotional nature that, on one occasion at least, he did not know whether he was in the body or out of it, who gave the position of overpowering primacy, in time and eternity, to the emotion of love and declared that it, love, was the impelling and constraining power in his life; and who, at the same time, engaged in the active and practical work of propagating the faith with a zeal that knew no bounds and did not even count life dear to himself if he might only finish his work and fulfill the mission with which he had been entrusted,—this man, towering in intellect, fervent in love and abundant in labors, is in himself an incontrovertible demonstration of the correctness of the proposition that the intellect, the susceptibility and the will, the knowing, the feeling and doing faculties and powers of our nature, must be co-ordinated, brought into harmonious and reciprocal relation to each other, in order to produce the ideal Christian life and character.

If this diagnosis or philosophy of the case, thus briefly and imperfectly stated, is accepted it will not be difficult to account

for the diverse and conflicting manifestation in the lives of individual Christians and in the history of the Christian Church during the almost two thousand years of its existence.

If perfection has not yet been attained by man in the individual life, or in social life, in corporate and political affairs, or in artistic attainments and scientific research (and no one will claim that it has) it ought not to be thought strange that there is still room for improvement in Christian life and character. Perfection seems to exist only in the Supreme Being. Taking humanity alone into the account we might for illustration, place the apostle Paul at the head of the class, and at the foot some poor ignorant heathen who had been brought to the point of being willing to part with his cue as expressive of his desire to enter on a new order of things. Taking these two as the extremes the rest of us fall in line somewhere in between.

Men, as a rule, are notoriously lopsided. Among the best of us in our day it is even a point of credit and distinction to be classed as specialists. The general practitioner in law, in medicine and even in theology is coming to be less and less in evidence. Very few are broad and capable enough, and life is too short, to stretch themselves over the entire field. Our limitations compel us to confine ourselves to a contracted area and concentrate our efforts along some particular line of a profession or calling in order to achieve success and make ourselves felt in the community or in the world. In every department of the world's work this holds true. The order of the day is specialists and specialties.

Now the trouble with humanity seems to be that the great majority of us are not intelligent and philosophical enough to see and understand that while this principle of specializing is all right and indeed necessary in the body corporate of society it is not only not helpful but in fact a positive hindrance in the development of the moral and spiritual side of our nature. We have all met with striking illustrations of this type of life in our churches. Here is a brother who can discourse quite learnedly on the eternal decrees, the *modus operandi* of the atonement, the significance of the sacraments of the Church and the nature of the resurrection and of the life to come. He might even fill, with more or less credit, the chair of dogmatics in a theological seminary. Intellectually he is well equipped, but he stops there.

Another regularly attends the weekly prayer meeting and seldom fails to avail himself of the privilege of "taking part." He has no use for "head religion" and sits, with eyes closed, and sings his soul away to everlasting bliss while the offering plate is passed. Still another is a pragmatist. He believes in doing things. He has little or no use for the theologian and his fine-spun theories and but scant patience with those who sing rhapsodical hymns, offer heart-touching prayers and deliver soul-stirring exhortations. He is practical.

Now if it were possible to fuse these three types into one we would have the kind of Christian character the Church so greatly stands in need of. Men and women who are fairly well versed in the teachings of God's Word and so are able to give a reason of the hope that is in them, whose hearts are deeply moved by the contemplation of the great truths of revelation and whose ardent love of them will constrain them to spend themselves and be spent in the service of the Master,—this is the all round and symmetrically balanced Christian against whom even the skeptic would hesitate to launch a criticism and whose consistent, godly life in the world would prove a powerful magnet to draw outsiders into the Church. With a goodly number of such men and women in our churches there would be no need to have recourse to fairs and festivals, to stereopticon shows and musical *concerts*, to lemonade and cigars all of which have proved in the past, and will continue to prove, a snare and delusion, not indeed in the matter of drawing a crowd seeking to be entertained for an evening, but in the effort to further the legitimate work of the Church.

With a goodly number of this kind of men and women in our churches there would also be less of absenteeism on the part of those intellectual and cultured people whose refined taste is offended and even shocked by the sometimes crude and ungrammatical prayers and exhortations of the emotionalists, while the pragmatist, knowing the truth and moved by the power of it, would no longer excuse himself from attending the services of the church, as one did to the writer, on the ground that Elder Jones was doing the praying while he was doing the paying. He believed in specializing in running the church as well as in other lines of business. I do not for a moment wish to be understood as intimating that this type of professors are insincere but

simply that, lacking symmetrical development, they are necessarily weak and inefficient for the work which the Church is set to do in the world.

Turning now from the individual professor and congregation the student of church history finds that the same unbalanced condition of things that we have been considering has obtained, and on a vastly broader scale, in the history of the Church as a whole. There have been periods when the best talent of the Church seems to have given itself up to the construction of great theological systems and the formulation of elaborate creeds. At other times Christendom was swept by a great tidal wave of unreasoning enthusiasm when tens of thousands of devotees perished by the sword of the infidel Turk in the crusades. At a later period of the Church's history, extending down to the time of some of us who are still living, there came another wave, commonly spoken of as "The New Measure Movement" that swept over the Church like the prairie fires in Illinois of fifty years ago, or the forest fires in the Northwest during the past year, leaving some sections of our country in such a condition that they have been aptly designated as "burnt districts."

While this revival movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth century is recognized as a logical and inevitable protest against the formalism and spiritual deadness of the Church that preceded it, the leaders of the movement, and more especially their successors in the work, seem to have suffered at least a partial eclipse of their thinking and reasoning faculties while they enthroned and gave unlimited sway to their emotional nature. The preacher, in many instances, practically abdicated his divinely appointed office as teacher and engaged in passionate oratory and inflammatory exhortation that swept his hearers off the benches and left them groveling on the floor, some groaning and shouting while others, lying for hours in a cataleptic state, had to be carried to their homes by their friends. In my youth I have seen middle aged men, otherwise sane and fairly intelligent, while the major part of the congregation were on their knees, crawling on their hands and knees from bench to bench pounding their brethren on their backs and in stentorian tones exhorting them to call mightily on God to have mercy on the sinners that were present. Not only was the emotional nature given full sway but various extraordinary methods were employ-

ed to work up the feelings. Boisterous singing, pious ejaculations, doleful groanings, clapping of the hands, pounding on the back, hand shaking, swaying of the body and other physical exercises were no uncommon manifestations when the preacher, aided by brethren and sisters endowed with extraordinary lung power and much physical endurance, had succeeded in working up an interest. I speak not of what has been reported to me but of what I myself have seen and heard.

It is not my purpose to discredit in the least degree what we speak of as a season of revival, but we must be careful to discriminate between the revival of religion and the methods sometimes resorted to in connection therewith. Some one has said that the fact that Christianity has survived in the world in spite of some of the methods employed for its propagation is at least one of the proofs of its divinity.

The New Measure Movement then, as I understand it, refers to the various methods employed in "getting up" and conducting revivals and these, in my humble judgment, have not only not been a helpful factor in the development of the General Synod but on the other hand have proved a positive hindrance to the progress of our Church that can be measured only by decades if not by a whole century. We must be careful, I repeat, to discriminate between the revival and the abnormal and unscriptural usages sometimes, not always, connected with and employed in a work of this kind. Take, for illustration, the revival that swept over Baltimore City about seventy years ago. It is said to have started in the old "Round Top" Baptist Church located at that time at the corner of Lombard and Sharp Sts., now at Fremont and Lafayette Aves. The interest increased and spread to other churches including the First Lutheran, and at that time our only English church in the city, of which Dr. Morris was pastor. That revival resulted in the addition of about 250 members to its communion and was the immediate cause of the establishment of the Second church on Lombard street, a little later on of the planting of the Third church on Monument near Gay, and still later was, to say the least, the indirect occasion of the organization of St. Mark's Church on Eutaw street.

That was a genuine work of grace that gave our Church a body of spiritually minded and active men and women that proved a very important factor in the development of the Lu-

theran Church of the General Synod type in this city. But there was another feature connected with that work in 1840 that must be reckoned with if we would get a correct estimate of its influence on our Church in Baltimore. The New Measures, so called, then in vogue became so identified with the work, in the minds of those good people, that they became practically incapable of recognizing the possibility of any one coming into the kingdom except under the conditions and by the methods employed at the time they were converted. For thirty, forty and fifty years those good people were continually harking back to the revival under Elder Knapp, lamenting the decadence of piety and not unfrequently criticising their pastors for not employing the methods (meaning the so-called New Measures) that had proved so effective in their day. Catechization of the young was regarded with scant favor and mere "book religion" contrasted unfavorably with "Holy Ghost religion." When the admission by confirmation of a class of catechumens was to be sanctioned by vote of the Church Council the question was raised again and again, "What reason have you for believing that these young people have been soundly converted and are fit for church membership?" For weeks before the time for the confirmation services the pastor would take occasion from the pulpit to hammer into the minds of his hearers the idea that the Church is a nursery for the care and training of the crooked little twigs into straight and strong fruit bearing trees, a factory or work-shop for shaping raw material into forms of service and beauty, the school of Christ for the education and development of the children and young people in the knowledge and service of God, rather than a warehouse in which to store the finished goods ready for shipment to Heaven. And this he did largely because he was afraid his class of catechumens, some of whom were the children of Christian parents, all in the Sunday School from the infant department up and faithfully instructed in the catechism for months, would be turned down because there might be some doubt as to whether they had been genuinely converted. In the case of some of those good and grand fathers in Israel it took all of a quarter to half a century to disabuse their minds of the idea (and no doubt some passed on to glory unpersuaded) that the New Measure plan was, to say the least, the best if not the only way of entering the kingdom.

From the day of Pentecost down to the present time the Church has had experience of seasons of revival and these epochs in her history have marked greater or less advance in spirituality and practical piety. But human nature being what it is it could hardly have been expected that some extravagances and even gross errors would not attend a movement that was so largely under the guidance of the emotionalist. Impassioned oratory, together with the fife and the drum, have proved powerful and effective factors in recruiting men for the army of the country, and similar methods are even now being employed, as in the Salvation Army, for gaining recruits for the Lord's army. By powerfully exciting the emotions, by playing on the feelings, crowds may be and have been swept into this that or the other movement at the will of the skilful manipulator, and the movement may be in the direction of a lynching bee, a labor strike, or the army or the Lord. In the last analysis it will be found that the underlying principle is primarily and fundamentally the same.

In every genuine revival of religion, however, whether the subject of such revival was an individual, a church or a whole community, it will be seen that it was the intelligent, persistent and earnest presentation of the great and fundamental truths of revealed religion that touched and moved the heart and swept the subject onward and upward into a new life of peace and joy and practical activity in the Master's service.

Such play on the emotions is a legitimate process. It is a normal, rational and logical movement of a well balanced mentality; and for the coming of such a revival every intelligent Christian will earnestly labor and fervently pray. But in such genuine revivals it has frequently occurred that the effect has been taken for the cause, and presently the attempt is made to "get up" a revival by resorting to genuflections and prostrations, to noise, disorder and extravagant rant. In this way the feelings may be worked up and aroused into at least a resemblance of that joy unspeakable which often and quite naturally follows the sense of pardoned sin. It is very much as if one should by friction or some form of mechanical manipulation of the thermometer cause the mercury to rise up into the nineties and then draw the conclusion that summer had come. A summer gotten up after that style is generally followed by a "cold spell" that

leaves the individual or Church not only in a worse state than before but also makes it vastly more difficult to bring about a genuine work of grace.

At the present time the Protestant churches of this country, and indeed of the world, seem to be waking up to the fact that the time has come in the history of the Church when there should be something doing that is worth while. What do preaching and praying and the singing of hymns amount to unless by such devotional exercises we are led to address ourselves in some practical, adequate and businesslike way to the work of evangelizing the world. This, I say, seems to be the sadly belated idea that is beginning to voice itself in the Church with some degree of emphasis.

I do not mean to say that this third stage in the Christian life, the very flower and fruitage of it, the doing of the will of the Master, has not yet been reached, but the Church itself, as expressed in the Laymen's Movement for the extension of the Kingdom, has declared and is declaring itself very positively, that what has heretofore been done is not at all commensurate with the necessities of the situation or the ability of the Master's followers. A prominent and well informed clergyman in our church has declared it to be his belief that in well nigh every congregation in our communion there are individual members who could and ought to give as much for the extension of the Kingdom as is now given by the entire congregation; that there are single congregations in every synod that could give more than is now contributed by the whole synod; and that there are single district synods that could give more than is now given by the General Synod as a whole.

In thus emphasizing the doing part of our religion we are, of course, not to neglect to enrich the intellect, or to suppress our feelings, but rather to strive after a broader, deeper and fuller understanding of our relation to God's Kingdom and its needs and to kindle in our hearts an ardent love, a burning zeal that will lead us to give ourselves and our means to the practical work of the world's salvation in measures heretofore unthought of.

What I have said thus far may possibly not be regarded as bearing directly on the subject, but I believe it furnishes us the ground work or, at least, a philosophical basis on which we may take our stand without fear of successful re-

futation from any quarter. I am aware of the fact that the revivals of religion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are spoken of as the New Measure Movement, but I do not admit that to be a correct definition of the term. Revivals are not new measures. They are not only as old as Pentecost but reach back through Old Testament history wherein are chronicled a number of famous revivals. The genuine revival, taking place under the Old or New dispensation, in ancient or modern times, has been fraught with great blessing and far-reaching benefit to the life of the Church whatever branch or communion may have been the subject of such divine visitation. Our position as a Church will be impregnable, I think, if we stand squarely and firmly in favor of the revival and just as firmly against the New Measures and methods that were so generally connected with them in the past century. Take as an illustration of the validity of this position, the experience of our own Church in Baltimore City. The fact is that, for the first thirty years following the revival under Elder Knapp, when the minds of the people were more or less obsessed with the New Measure idea, comparatively little progress was made by our Church in this city, while during the succeeding thirty years, when we had gotten measurably back to the saner and more Lutheran methods of work, the number of our churches has increased almost five hundred per cent.

Other instances might be cited to show that the progress of the work of our Church has been delayed many decades by a similar condition of things so that we are warranted in concluding that the New Measure Movement (bearing in mind the distinction between the revival and the measure) has not only not been a factor in the development of the General Synod, but on the contrary, has greatly crippled and retarded the growth of our Church.

The rupture which began at York, Pa., in 1864, was the final culmination of the Definite Platform movement as over against the Unaltered Augsburg Confession position, and it would not be an easy task to adequately set forth the great harm done to our Church by the split at Fort Wayne in 1866. Brethren in the ministry became alienated and viewed each other with suspicion; congregations were disrupted resulting in prolonged and bitter lawsuits for the possession of church property; opposition

congregations struggled for a foothold in communities barely able to support one church; each branch must have its own colleges, theological seminaries, periodicals, orphanages, mission boards, publication houses, etc., resulting in a wasteful dissipation of energy and of means besides presenting to the world the sad and humiliating spectacle of a house divided against itself.

More recently and quite within the memory of well nigh all our readers, came the conflict between the so-called radicals and conservatives following the adoption of the Common Service by the three leading bodies of our Church. What was intended to be a bond of union between the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod of the South and is, we have reason for believing, slowly but surely working to that end, was made the occasion of a bitter controversy that very seriously disturbed the peace of the Church and hindered the progress of its legitimate work.

At bottom the same cause was at work,—namely the failure to recognize the fact that deep, earnest and practical piety is quite as likely to be found in connection with a uniform, orderly and dignified service in God's house as with a haphazard-on-the-spur-of-the-moment-go-as-you-please style of worship. And we have reason for believing that more and more the Church is coming to this conclusion. With the faithful use of the means of grace in the orderly and intelligent manner that has characterized the Lutheran Church in her past history we can see no reason why we should not continue in the years to come, as in the past, to grow in piety, in devotion to the Master and in every form of practical work for the extension of His Kingdom.

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE IV.

THE LIFE AND MESSAGE OF TOLSTOI.

BY REV. UPTON A. HANKEY, D.D.

Tolstoi, the sensitive, the voluptuous, the rich, the independent, the intellectual, the idealistic, the affectionate, the ingenuous, the religious, the critic, the reformer, the socialist, the "full-fledged nihilist," the erratic, the unclassifiable, by the force of his many-sided personality, and acknowledged ability, has challenged the attention of the reading and thinking world. Having run the whole gamut of human life and passion, few have experienced more widely contrasted phases of life. Born into the higher circle of Russian aristocracy, associated with the best writers of his day, and standing on the high plane of ethical Christianity, he preached—for he was in one sense a preacher, never having written anything, without taking a text of Scripture—he preached on—non-resistance no matter how severe the provocation, equal labor for all no matter how menial, and a literal obedience to the Words of Christ as taught in His Sermon on the Mount. His message, though mostly unwelcome to us, is listened to by many, and is determinedly effecting the current thought of our time in some basic matters.

With kaleidoscopic characteristics this man looms up before us as, in many respects, very great, and very good, "One of the greatest and best of his time," says W. Dean Howells. For the reason that he was separated from us by the earth's diameter and a strange tongue, he is comparatively little known, and few private libraries have many or any of his books. But to those who are looking out on the horizon of things, he is seen towering up like a mountain in the distance with natural springs and verdant growths at the base, but whose brow is obscurely veiled in mist and cloud.

This great Russian novelist, social reformer, and ethical preacher of Christianity, was born August 28, 1828, on the paternal estate, Yasnaya Polyana (Clearfield), situated one hundred and twenty miles south of Moscow. Here he passed nearly all of his life. His family is said to have been of German de-

scent originally bearing the plebeian name of "Dick" (Stout), which was changed to its Russian equivalent, Tolstoi, when his ancestors migrated into that country at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Peter Tolstoi, the first eminent member of the family, was an intimate friend of Peter the Great, by whom he was richly endowed and raised to courtly rank. The father of our hero was described by those who knew him as a stately, fascinating personage, his mother was a lady of personal charms and of great wealth, tender, plaintive, mystical, as scarcely belonging to this world. She possessed the gift of inventing tales and stories, which her son certainly inherited from her.

Being early orphaned Tolstoi's early education was neglected; after schooling on his maternal estate, two years were spent at the University of Kazan; but he acknowledged that he learned more from the simple peasantry, and field and forest. He had "enormous resources of natural gift," the high order of genius that could unite the culture of the schools with the perennial springs of intuition. His desire was to excel everyone in everything. Even physically it was his ambition to be stronger and more dexterous than his companions. On his return to Yasnaya Polyana his steward coming to him in the morning for orders would frequently find him hanging in flannels, head downwards, on a trapeze, in which position he would discuss the best modes of sowing and threshing, the steward accompanying him round and round the room as he turned somersaults without interrupting the conversation. This was to him what the hewing down of trees was to Gladstone, or to Roosevelt. An account of his boyhood appears in "My Confession," where we learn that he was brought up in the Orthodox Russian Church, amidst a life with its strange intermixture of patriarchal and aristocratic manners. He was bright and quick, but not good looking, as he one day made the discovery in the looking-glass that there was nothing aristocratic in his face, but on the contrary he was for all the world like a peasant, or "moujik."

After a few years on his estate, having secured a commission in the army, he served in the artillery in the Crimea and took active part in the defense of the city of Sevastopol, when he "gayly advanced to bastion four the bastian of death." It was war itself which taught Tolstoi to abhor war. At the end of

the war he entered upon a literary career, went to St. Petersburg where he was welcomed by the highest literary circles of the day. For some years before this, and now, he led a dissipated life, drank, gambled, and fought duels, like his companions, but his soul all the while yearned for something better. He made at this time a tour of Europe to visit the great thinkers of England and the continent to question them as to the meaning of life.

Returning to Yasnaya Polyana, he became head-master of a village school—the first free school that ever existed in Russia—published an educational journal, wrote a number of school books, became a country magistrate, and strove chiefly for the instruction and improvement of the peasantry. His pedagogical methods were revolutionary. He adopted the ideas that “all constraint is dangerous,” and that “teachers ought to consult not their own convenience, but the convenience of their pupils.” His pupils were allowed to do as they liked, they could come and go at will, sit on the floor or on chairs, group together in a corner or stand at the window, for there was no discipline of any sort. He never taught anything they did not wish to learn, never took up a lesson to which the children objected, nor continued it when their interest began to lag. He believed an atmosphere of freedom was more favorable to education than one of coercion. Accordingly he was not the least worried when his scholars deserted the room and took a holiday or two each week.

The romance of his marriage about this time to a daughter of a Moscow physician, is rather minutely described in his novel, “*Anna Karenina*,” in the courtship of Kitty and Levine. The union proved completely happy, and began the most joyous period of Tolstoi’s life. They lived in the country and rarely went to town. He wished nothing better than to pass his days in the bosom of his family, and hated to be away even a single day, and would hasten home when the detaining business was transacted.

The light of a better life now began to dawn on his soul, and his oft reading of the Gospel inclined him thoroughly to the practice of love, humanity, meekness, self-denial, and a returning of good for evil. His strange instinctive affection for the working classes moved him to seek their welfare, and he began to think that if he would attain to an understanding of the mean-

ing of life, he must seek it amongst those who have not lost their grip upon it, among the millions who live close to nature. Accordingly he applied himself to the study of the simple, unlearned, poor peasantry of his neighborhood, and the more he studied them, the more he became convinced that they had a true faith. They passed their days contentedly in heavy labor; they lived, suffered, and drew near death in quiet confidence and even joy. He describes this period of conflict as a feeling after God, an effort to apprehend what God is.

Accordingly he renounced the life of his own class, as he tells us in his "Confessions," for he had come to see that it was not a real life, only the semblance of one, that its superfluous luxury prevented the possibility of understanding life, and that in order so to do he must know, not an exceptional parasitic life, but the simple life of the working classes. He also left the Church because as he believed its adherents did not practice the truths of the Gospel. He commenced the study of the Gospels for himself with unusual thoroughness and patience, taking up the Greek language, so that he might not be misled by translators, and entering fully into the Spirit of the Gospels he read and re-read them, and was most deeply impressed by the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, all of which he understood literally, allowing no place for poetic temperament, oriental imagery, or beautiful metaphor.

It might be best at this place to glance briefly at the remaining years of Tolstoi's life, before taking up the consideration of his system of ethics, or forming an idea of his message, and opinions as a whole. He himself divides his life into four periods: First, that splendid, innocent, joyful, poetic period of childhood; second, those dreadful twenty years of coarse dissoluteness, of ambition, of vanity, of sensuousness; third, the period from his marriage until his spiritual birth; and lastly, the interesting closing period in which he regards himself as truly having lived.

Once again he made Moscow his brief home, and devoted himself to philanthropic work. He engaged in taking the census of the city, and was deeply impressed with the number of poor in the population. He made up his mind that every man should perform some manual labor, and selected for his own, while he

was in town, the sawing of wood in the wood-yards of the suburbs.

Filled with disgust for the fashionable life he had been so long living, he felt an irresistible impulse to renounce the luxuries of his position, and began to wear a peasant's garb as a protest against the falsehoods of caste and monopoly. He wanted to exemplify the literal teachings of Christ, and live as He had lived. He stripped his house of everything superfluous, there was not a rug on the floor, nor an ornament on the table, nor a picture on the wall; his dress was a peasant's blouse; he became a vegetarian, and touched neither tea nor coffee, nor sugar, nor tobacco; and beside his plain book-cases stood his scythe, axe and pick. He sat at one end of the table and ate from bare boards his coarse meal, while his family was served with the finest delicacies by servants.

He had no use for money. Mr. W. D. Howells says, "There is this about such poverty—that it is imaginative in essence and dramatic in form rather than real. The man experienced poverty; lived the life of the poor, wore their clothes, and ate their food, but he could not feel the dread that is never lifted from the very poor, the dread of actual want. He was defended from the consequences of his precept and his practice by the inalienable wealth of his family. It was undeniably grotesque, but it was also pathetic, almost the most pathetic predicament in history for a noble and sincere and unselfish man."

About two weeks before the end of his life with no other explanation of his purpose than that he intended "to retire from the world," he left his home and embarked on a journey toward a vague destination. In order to cover his movements he announced that he was going to Moscow, but later changed cars and boarded a slow train for the Caucasus. Tolstoi, with two companions, made his way to an unventilated third-class compartment, which was already overcrowded with peasants. He developed a fever and left the train at Astafova, a little flag station, where he died. A letter sent to his wife at the outset of his journey contained these pathetic lines: "I retire from the world to complete my life in solitude. I ask that you do not seek my place of sojourn, and that you do not come to it, if it is discovered. I beg forgiveness for the grief that I may cause you."

It was unfortunate that his belief and habits forced a so dramatic close of his career; but such were the circumstances surrounding his life that he could not possibly die wanting, as a peasant, unattended, and bare, but was found and ministered to by loving hands in his closing moments, and the simple announcement of his death brought the whole literary world to his dying bed, notwithstanding that he wanted to keep them all away.

"Come not, when I am dead,
To drop thy foolish tears upon my grave,
To trample round my fallen head,
And vex the unhappy dust thou wouldst not save,
There let the wind sweep and the plover cry;
But thou, go by.
I am sick of time,
And I desire to rest.
Pass on weak heart, and leave me where I lie.
Go by, go by."

These words of Tennyson well express the world-wearied spirit of this man for whom wealth, fame, pleasure, life and death, had not any more a meaning.

His treatise "On Life" is a sane and readable book, which seems to take hold of the reader with a strange power. It is through the reading and understanding of this treatise that we should approach his ethical system. Here we get the central point of view of his opinions. Most men, he says, lead only to animal life. Our real life begins with the awakening of our consciousness, at the moment when we perceive that life lived for self cannot produce happiness. We feel that there must be some other good; we make an effort to find it, but failing, we fall back into our old ways. These are the first throes of the birth of the veritable human life. Love is the only true manifestation of life. It is an activity which has for its object the good of others.

He mentions five ways for strengthening ourself on the path of life: attention to the Word of God, communion with saints, peaceful intercourse with men, renunciation of property, and the recognition over oneself and over others of no other power

than the one which is given by the spirit of truth. He simply says: "Renounce your selfish ends; love all men—all creatures—and devote your life to them. You will then be conscious of possessing eternal life, and for you there will be no death." Immortality is an assured conviction, eternal life may not be personal, but absorption with the infinite. There is no resurrection of the body. This states briefly his philosophy of life.

We now turn to a consideration of his *social message*. Tolstoi was a socialist of the first rank, an ardent lover of men, ready to sacrifice everything for society's sake. He also denounces patriotism, saying for a Christian there is no country, for a Christian there is no property, for a Christian all are equal. "The more a man gives to others and the less he asks for himself, the better he is; the less he gives to others and the more he demands for himself, the worse he is."

The writing of his great novel, "Anna Karenina," reflects his disgust with the frivolities and light tinsel of society, and all conventional forms of life. After its appearance he adopted the peasant's life and labors, and developed more fully his socialistic scheme of philosophy. Renouncing all desire for fame, speaking contemptuously of his writings, and regarding them as objects of misdirected labors, he devotes all his time, talents and energies to the improvement of the peasant classes, working at the shoemaker's bench and in the fields, eating plowman's fare, and striving for the day when as he hoped there should no longer be either organized religion or government, and that all people should dwell together in equality and peace and mutual brotherliness, none high, none low, none rich, none poor, none better, none worse. Tolstoi set himself against all class distinctions, as the main source of enmity between men. "I can no longer," he says, "try to rise above other men, to separate myself from them, nor can I admit either rank or title for myself or others, except the title of 'man.' I can no longer seek fame or glory, nor can I help trying to get rid of my riches which separate me from my fellow creatures. I cannot help seeking in my way of life, in its surroundings, in my food, my clothes, my manners, to draw nearer the majority of men, and to avoid all that separates me from them." He wrought for such a condition of society when all men shall fulfill Christ's commands,—when they

shall not quarrel, nor be selfish, nor swear, nor offer violence, nor wage war upon one another.

"We are brothers," he says, "but every morning my brother or sister performs for me the most menial offices. We are brothers; but I must have my cigar, my sugar, my mirror, or what not,—objects whose manufacture has often cost my brothers and sisters their health, yet I do not for that reason forbear to use these things; on the contrary I even demand them. We are brothers; and yet I support myself by working in some bank, commercial house, or shop, and am always trying to raise the price of the necessities of life for my brothers and sisters. We are brothers; I receive a salary for judging, convicting and punishing the thief, or the prostitute, whose existence is the natural outcome of my own system of life, and I fully realize that I should neither condemn nor punish. We are brothers; yet I make my living by collecting taxes from the poor, that the rich may live in luxury and idleness." He once went to see a sick beggar and witnessed terrible poverty. "What I ought really to have done," he says, "would have been to have remained there and not have gone away, until he was made equal with me." "True life," he holds, "is only in the relations between men." A man comes to speak with me. I am busy, to finish is the form the plan; and the visitor is the man and my relation to him,—this is true life. We must stop demanding other people's service. It seems strange, but the first thing we have to do, before anything else, is to serve ourselves, that is, to make our own fires, fetch our own water, cook our own dinners, and wash our own dishes and dirty linen."

Ownership is a fiction,—an imaginary something, which exists only for those who believe in Mammon, and so serve him. The believer in Christ's teaching is freed from ownership. Ownership with the right to defend it and with the duty of the government to secure and recognize it, is not only not a Christian, but an anti-Christian, invention. Make your own spoon to eat with it, and that, too, so long as another person does not need it. If there were no money, nor anything connected with it, a man could not help but have bread; and if there were no Tsar, nor that which is connected with him, nobody would be sitting in a prison. These thoughts well express his revolt against modern life.

His external extravagant social conceptions are not illogically due to the wretched social system of inequality, unfraternity and oppression with the starving millions of Russians, and the upper crust of society remaining entirely indifferent to the immanent calamities. It was as he saw, an anti-Christian, non-brotherly relation of cultured people to the poor, and the manual laborers who were always experiencing want, suffering and sorrow.

He is equally bitter in denunciation of all law and government. Laws are the offspring of party conflicts, false dealing, and the greed of gain; and therefore it is impossible for people to believe that obedience to civil or state laws can ever satisfy the rational demands of human nature. A Christian who submits to the inner, the divine law, is unable to execute the bid-dings of the outward law, as in the case of the demands made upon him by the government. He cannot acknowledge the obligation of obeying any individual whomsoever, cannot acknowledge himself to be what is called a subject. For a Christian to promise to subject himself to any government whatsoever—a subjection which may be considered the foundation of State life—is a direct negation of Christianity: since an individual who promises beforehand to obey implicitly every law that men may enact, by that promise utters an emphatic denial of Christianity, whose very essence is obedience in all contingencies to the law which he feels to be within him—the law of love. Christianity faithfully interpreted, saps the foundations of the civil law. Until men felt the necessity of justifying the establishment of the Christian State, they always accepted that interpretation. The cleverly constructed theories intended to reconcile the doctrines of Christianity with that of the State date back to the time when rulers of nations adopted a nominal, external Christianity. But in these times it is impossible for a sincere and earnest man not to perceive the incompatibility of the Christian doctrine of love, meekness of spirit, and forgiveness of injuries, with the despotism, the violence, and the wars of the State. The profession of true Christianity not only forbids the recognition of the State, but strikes at its very foundations. It cannot be proved, as the partizans of the State claim, that its destruction would be followed by a general upheaval, by robberies and murders, and by the nullification of all social laws, and the return of man to a condition of barbarism. The State may at one

time have been necessary, but "I can only say I have no need of it, nor can I conform to its requirements, I need none of the institutions established by the State."

Some say we cannot dispense with the State until all men are Christians, because even among those who claim the title there are many who are very far from being Christian—evil doers, who seek their own gratification at the expense of their fellow-men, and if the governments were overthrown, so far from improving the condition of the people, it would greatly add to their miseries. But when they declare that the evil doers would ride roughshod over the defenseless and innocent were it not for the authority of the State, they imply that the governing power is vested always in a body of virtuous men who control all the evil doers. The wicked always rule over the good and do violence to them. Cain did violence to Abel, the astute Jacob betrayed the trusting Esau, and was himself deceived by Laban; Caiaphas and Pilate sat in judgment on Christ; the Roman emperors ruled over Seneca, Epictetus, and others. So whether the State is or is not to be abolished, the position of the innocent, who are oppressed by the tyrants, will not be materially changed.

Men are not to be frightened by being told that the wicked will oppress the good, because that is the natural course, and will never change. Therefore the defenders of the existing social system are self-deceived when they say that, since violence barely holds the evil and un-Christian elements of society in awe, its subversion, and the substitution of the moral influence of public opinion, would leave us helpless in face of them. They are wrong, because violence does not protect mankind; but it deprives men of the only possible chance of an effectual defense by the establishment and propagation of the Christian principle of life.

He claims that the position of the Christian world, with its fortresses, cannon, dynamite, guns, torpedoes, prisons, gallows, Churches, factories, custom houses, and palaces, is monstrous.

Tolstoi preached non-resistance with unceasing zeal. The words of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount were taken by him in their literal sense as, "That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee

to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." On this he says, "Never resist evil by violence. If any one smites thee, bear it; if any one takes away what is thine, let him have it; if any one make thee labor, do so." We can make no greater mistake than to lift our hand against wrong. The man who will not strike back is the only man who cannot be conquered, and the treatment of him becomes an insoluble problem for the tyrant. It is the non-resistant alone who can overcome superior power. "If all the members of a family were Christians and gave up their lives to the service of others, no one would despoil them or kill them."

That this idea of non-resistance touches a chord in the human heart cannot be denied, but this ideal state is far to reach, and we may quote the words of Tennyson in "The Golden Year"—

"Ah! when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal Peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the Golden Year?"
"Ah, folly! for it lies so far away,
Not in our time, nor in our children's time,
'Tis like the second world to us that live;
'T were all as one to fix our hopes on Heaven.
As on this vision of the Golden Year."

We now come to examine and analyze his *distinctively religious views*. He posed as a religious reformer. His extremely cynical and critical views of things, his pessimism, are undoubtedly the clear revulsion from his earlier appalling dissipations, now bringing forward their meed of retribution. He feels himself called to denounce and renounce the whole order of things, and we have a volume of anathemas against civilization, science, Church, State, and even art itself. His theology is mystical and rationalistic. In summing up the results of his Gospel studies, he expresses his firm belief in Christ's teachings, and that happiness on earth is possible only when all men fulfil Christ's teaching, which is possible, easy and pleasant. "I understand now," he says, "that He alone is above all others who humbles

himself before others, and makes himself the servant of all. Everything that once seemed to me right and important—honor, glory, civilization, wealth, the complications and refinements of life, luxury, rich food, fine clothing, etiquette—has become for me wrong and despicable. Rusticity, obscurity, poverty, austerity, simplicity of surroundings, of food, of clothing, of manners, all have become right and important to me. I cannot encourage or take part in licentious pastimes, novels, plays, poems, balls and the like, which are so many snares for myself and for others."

He estimates life and every act by the Sermon on the Mount, all of which he understands in a literal sense. His book entitled "My Religion," sets forth distinctly most of his religious views, and is an exegetical commentary upon Christ's Sermon on the Mount. As an example of his independent exegesis we cite Matthew 5:32, "But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." He claims to have examined all commentators from Chrysostom to the most learned of the present day, and pronounces them all in error. This passage gives no sanction for divorce; for the marriage relation is indissoluble. The usual interpretation here which throws the guilt of marital infidelity upon the woman is strange and unexpected, and here in relation to the context, absurd. The word *πορνεία* is an entirely different word from *μοιχεία* and never signifies an act, but a quality, a state of depravity and never can be translated "adultery," or "fornication," which idea is always expressed through the Gospels by *μοιχεία*. The passage clears up if the word translated "adultery," or "fornication," is translated "libertinism." This sets forth the purport of the qualifying phrase, "Saving for the cause of fornication," and throws the guilt of marital infidelity on the man, and not the woman only. After many pages of close exegetical sifting and weighing he declares the meaning to be this, "whoever puts away his wife, besides being himself guilty of libertinism, exposes her also to the commission of adultery." Christ replies to the theory of the Pharisees, who held that a man who abandons his wife to marry another without the intention of giving himself up to libertinism, does not commit adultery. Christ replies to

this theory that the abandonment of a wife, even if not for the purpose of libertinism, but to marry another, is none the less adultery. The passage is construed thus: "Whoever puts away his wife, besides the fault of libertinism, obliges her to be an adulteress."

Another example of his exegesis is found in the word "enemy," where Christ says, "Love your enemies." This is not a personal enemy, but a foreigner, a person of another than the Hebrew race. In fact to him the Gospels have many additions and interpretations, and are much like a sack of refuse in which are a number of infinitely precious pearls.

He sums up the teachings of Christ in five commands:

1. Live in peace with all men. 2. Be pure. 3. Take no oaths. 4. Never resist evil. 5. Renounce racial distinctions. "A man has but to understand his life as Christianity teaches him to understand it; that is, he must realize that it does not belong to himself, nor to his family, nor to the State, but to Him who sent him into the world."

Tolstoi's name is anathema to all orthodox theology. Christian virtues are admired and exalted by him, but all Christian institutions and doctrines are detested and opposed. He calls for the abolition of the Church as well as the State. The Sermon on the Mount and human creeds, like the Apostles' and Nicene, according to his view, exclude each other. Human creeds have no meaning to one who believes in the Sermon on the Mount. "The more mystical grew the apprehension of Christ's teaching," says he, "the more the miraculous element entered into it; and the more miraculous it became, the farther it was from its original meaning; and the more complicated, mystical and remote from its original meaning it came to be, the more necessary it was to declare its infallibility."

His theology is quite mystical and profoundly rationalistic; a queer blending of the elements of Quakerism and Rationalism. It is understood to deny miracles, the inspiration of the Bible, the descent of the spirit, the validity of prayer, the divinity and resurrection of Christ, the atonement by blood, and that Christ ever founded anything like the Church in its ecclesiastical sense. He regards the Old Testament on a par with the literature of other early people. He disapproves of Paul's epistles, whom he accuses of giving a fatal bias to Christ's teachings, and turning

men's minds from their simplicity and directness. He quotes scornfully Paul's expression, "The powers that be are ordained of God." Jesus is to him only an example of supreme influence. The Trinity is denied and also the need of the Sacraments. The chief doctrines of the Church are called "fallacious conceptions of Christianity," "perversions of the professors of theology," "contemptible inventions," "foolish superstitions," and "old-time paganisms."

The reasons for his extreme bitterness against the Church and its dogmas are not far to seek, when we consider his environment of the corrupt Russian Church, its superstitions in veneration of images and relics, in the spitting of the sponsors at the devil at the baptism of a child, and children kneeling before a board with painted pictures of Christ and the saints, and other superstitious forms which destroy the vital conception of Christianity.

Tolstoi won his world-wide distinction by his *literary work*. "The domain of his genius was fiction, and not the bewildering muddlements of a pseudo-philosophy." As to his attempted social and religious reforms, we may say in Tennyson's lines:

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be;
They are but broken lights of thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

His peculiar philosophy and ethics will not live, but his short stories will have an enduring day. However his system of philosophy is concretely woven through his allegorical tales. These "Tales" are serious and curious, most skillful in invention, uplifting and helpful in their general tone. They were written as tracts, or sermons (as many of them have a text of Scripture to start with) for the peasants, and represent the author's views of the real life which earns bread literally in the sweat of the brow, and does good for evil, makes no resistance to violence, and is victorious over temptation. His theories of communism, of non-resistance, of the blessings of poverty, of a laboring life, and of unselfish service are concretely expressed in these short stories. To Tolstoi's mind

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade,
A breath can make them, as a breath has made,
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

Tolstoi's great genius must be conceded, and none will deny his naivete; his endowment of sincerity and truthfulness, his recognition of life's facts, and that he preached humility and purity. But as to the beneficial tendency of some of his books opinions differ. Our judgment is that many of his books are exceedingly injurious and pernicious to the public mind. His conclusions are new, unexpected, and contrary to what are usually held. Many of his books, however, can be read with profit by the clergy; for many sermon-seeds and illustrations may be found in them; especially is this true of his "Short Tales," "The Kingdom of God is Within You," "Life," "What is Art?" his "Confession," his "Religion," "Resurrection," and his letters. He is a master of illustration, and his illustrations are taken from nature and everyday life.

We recall the names of some of his books not already mentioned, "The Cossacks," "The Death of Ivan Ilyitch," "Master and Man," "The Kreutzer Sonata," "Scenes of the Siege of Sevastopol," "The Invaders," "The Russian Proprietors," "Esarhaddon," and as paramount the five volumes of "War and Peace." This masterpiece of the world's literature, a library in itself, its thousands of pages transcribed with his own hand seven times before he was satisfied with it, is the history of the life and death struggle of the Russian nation with its most terrible enemy, the first Napoleon. The Russian nation is the real hero of the romance. The character of Napoleon is portrayed vividly in the flesh in these pages. The philosophy of these books is tinged with Schopenhauerism, and religion is discarded. In "Anna Karenina" we find in photographic minuteness human weakness growing into crime and misery. It well contrasts the frivolities and vanities of the worldly life with the sweet, holy calm enjoyed by those who live contentedly amidst the beauties of nature and the pleasures of the family. The book, though pronounced one of the greatest novels in literature,

is, in my judgment, injurious, and like raking in the filth of a cesspool rather than in the clean soil of the garden. On the fly-leaf of the volume owned by the Carnegie Circulating Library of Pittsburg, are found the words, "This book must not be loaned to minors." Other books as "My Confession," "Resurrection," "My Religion," set forth completely his ethical system. Tolstoi himself appears in most of his books, and may be identified with Levine in "Anna Karenina," and with Piere in his volumes of "War and Peace." This key enables us to get more fully in hand at first sources the life and message of this remarkable man, whose name W. D. Howells places beside that of Napoleon, and Lincoln, as the three supreme names of the century in which these men lived.

It is worthy of observation that all his books, short stories, and his novels, start with a text of Scripture, and all his writings are suffused with Scripture quotations, many very lengthy. His literature is inseparable from his religion, and his art seems always most spiritual. He hated the evils in the characters he depicted, and loved the good. He is didactic in all his books, and writes as if he were writing a text-book, and never loses an opportunity to teach his ethical views. He is a rationalistic mystic, a rare combination of Quakerism and Unitarianism. The church historian would place him among the deformation types of Christianity. It is worthy of note that, in these days when Mormonism holds its own, and Eddyism flourishes, and even Eliotism hovers on the horizon, the Tolstoian sects both in Europe and this country have failed. Jane Addams tried to put his socialistic ideas into practice at the Hull House, Chicago, but has recently acknowledged her failure.

Tolstoi was an ardent advocate of the return to nature and the soil, but unlike Rousseau's scheme, it is nature sanctified by the religious element. He was a man of the tenderest sympathies and firmest convictions, the laboring peasants best advocate. His religion was a religion of spirit.

Tolstoi's social code levels down. "You are my brother," says he to the poor and degraded, "and therefore I will live with you and be one of you." He is truly a son of his own country, identified with his people and age. He is narrow while he professes to write a message for humanity; he is provincial, iconoclastic, illogical, lacking in completeness and fullness of

life, a strange figure, "a colossal personality. If you were to ask, "What did Tolstoi do?" "What did he accomplish?" I would answer, he lived an exemplary life, aimed to be an example of Christ's teachings, overturned established values, threw a searching light upon society, Church and State, and sought to turn men to the pure teachings of Christ as found in the Sermon on the Mount.

We have endeavored to give a resume, to reflect the life and message of this man, as discoverable in his writings; this peasant nobleman, this aristocrat born into Russia's ruling class, this critic who condemns all governments and churches, money, courts of justice, ownership of property, and yet who owned an estate worth five hundred thousand dollars, and believed in the theories of Henry George. Though it was not his own fault that he did not rid himself of it all, and give it to the poor peasants. There was something in him so kind, so naive, so obstinate. If we criticise him for vagaries and aberrations in his teachings, for denying himself so unnecessarily, for making the externals of religion so bare and severe, we should remember that although it may be Tolstoi *contra munda* there is room in the world for such a man. We cannot withhold a feeling of admiration for the heroism, boldness and courage of the man who could ring out such striking appeals against tyranny, injustice, oppression and hypocrisy in religion. We count it a pleasure and profit to have read his books, and to have gathered from them his message to the world. We have accepted what we could but for the reason that our reservations still outnumber our affirmations, we cannot be fully counted a disciple of Tolstoi.

"The letter fails, and systems fall,
And every symbol wanes;
The Spirit over-brooding all
Eternal love remains."

New Kensington, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S PERSONAL PRESENCE.

BY REV. LEANDER KEYSER, D.D.

During the last Pentecostal season many things were said about "Christ's going away and the Holy Spirit coming in His stead." It may be well now to make a restatement of the Biblical and Lutheran doctrine of the real and personal presence of our Lord. After all the years of Lutheran teaching, it is a little surprising to find so many writers and speakers treating Christ as if He were present in the world, not personally, but only by proxy—that is, by and through the Holy Spirit.

Note the following quotation: "It is through the Spirit that Christ keeps His promise of being with us even to the end of the world. Personally, He is no longer present; we cannot see or hear or touch Him; but His power is present in the hearts of believers through the Spirit that comes in the Word and the Sacrament."

The writer's meaning may be correct, but his mode of expression is very faulty, and seems to indicate a hazy conception of the person of Christ. Surely our Lutheran confessions nowhere teach that the Holy Spirit *mediates the presence* of Christ; nor do we believe that the Sacred Writings uphold such a doctrine. In as comprehensive a view as possible let us look at the Biblical teaching on the person and presence of Christ.

It is true that Christ does in several places speak about "going away." What He meant by this mode of expression will be explained later. Just now we are concerned to note that He speaks just as clearly and positively about "coming again." He says, "I will not leave you comfortless (bereaved); I will come to you." Let it be observed that He says "I." Nor does He intimate that He will come through the mediation of another. "I will come to you." Again He says: "In that day (the day of the Spirit's coming) ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." This declaration points explicitly to the personal presence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then He adds: "He that hath my com-

mandments and keepeth them he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love Him and will *manifest myself* unto him..... If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him, and *make our abode* with him." The personal presence of both the Father and the Son is taught in the foregoing passage. Afterward our Lord adds these most significant words, which should be pondered: "Ye have heard how I said to you, I go away, and I come unto you. If ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I." (The Father, being all divine, was greater than Christ in the time and state of His humiliation; therefore in His humanity He would ascend to the Father to be glorified, and thus filled with all the fullness of God, so that He (Christ), in both His humanity and divinity, might be transcendent and therefore immanent and ubiquitous. Was not that reason enough to make the disciples rejoice?) At another place He says, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." At still another place, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them." The apostle Paul teaches the same truth when he says, "Christ in you the hope of glory." Also in the great passage, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Now note, all these statements indicate Christ's real and personal presence. He says "I." Never once does He give the impression that He will be present through the Holy Spirit or by proxy, but always in His own person. When He speaks of the coming and abiding presence of the Spirit, He does not intimate that He (the Spirit) is coming to take His place, but is coming in addition to the personal presence of the Christ. Therefore He promises, "I will send you *another* comforter."

Then what does Christ mean by "going away?" For He does say plainly, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send Him unto you." The whole truth is that Christ will go away, then will come again and be an abiding, never-failing presence. How can these things be? This, we think, is the explanation: By His going away He means departing from the physical, sensuous, visible, and merely local realm and going back into the invisible and divine realm from which He descend-

ed when He came forth from the Father. However, to go back into the invisible realm does not mean absence; it simply means departure in one form and manner to come again and be graciously present in another and a superior form and manner. And what is the new form in which the Christ is present? It is the glorified form.

Observe the whole inspiring teaching of God's Word. So far as Christ's humanity was concerned He did depart, for He ascended to the right hand of God and was glorified, His human nature being filled with all the power and grace and glory of the divine nature, so that the apostle could say, "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." What a profound saying! Add to it this statement of Paul (Eph. 4:10): "He that descended is the same also that ascended *far above all heavens*, that He might *fill all things*." The meaning of it is that Christ in His whole theanthropic person ascended above and beyond time and space, so that He, in His whole human-divine nature, might be present everywhere. That is, He became transcendent that He might become immanent. Therefore the Bible teaches the immanence of Christ in His whole glorified person. Thus it was necessary that He, in His human nature, should "go away," that is, ascend above the limitations of time and space into the transcendent sphere, in order that His human nature as well as His divine nature, might become transcendent, and thereby become immanent and ubiquitous. This is what He must mean, then, when He says He will "come again" and will be "with you always, even unto the end of the world." Only by ascending and becoming transcendent could He be with His people everywhere at the same time, and that in His own right and person, and not in the person of another member of the Holy Trinity.

What is meant, then, by His "*sending* the Holy Spirit?" And why did He intimate that, if He did not go away, the Spirit would not come? This is the evident meaning: First, as to the "*sending*;" only after Christ had ascended above all heavens—that is, into the transcendent realm—could He send the Holy Spirit, in full redeeming power, into the realm of time and space to abide with the disciples forever. Therefore the "*sending*" means the Spirit's coming from the Father and the glorified Son into the human and local realm. Secondly, it was only after the Son was glorified that the Holy Spirit could

take of the fullness of redemptive grace from the Son and bring it to His people. For the Spirit to have come before Christ's transcendent glorification would have been premature; would have been to come before He was clothed with all redeeming power; before He was fully equipped for His functional work of regenerating and illuminating and witnessing to Christ's grace and power within the human heart. As our Lord says, it is part of the Spirit's office to "take of the things of Christ and show them" to the disciples. This the Spirit could do only after Christ had carried His humanity to perfect victory and glory. Had the Spirit come prior to the ascension of Christ, He could have brought only the truths and graces of divinity to His people on the earth, and therefore His testimony in the heart would not have been clear for the incarnate Son of God; but coming, as He did, after Christ's ascension and glorification, the Spirit brings the power and grace of the Redeemer's triumphant and glorified humanity to our hearts, and thus His witness is clear for the whole Christ.

What, then, is the complete teaching of the Scriptures as to the divine presence? Surely that the whole blessed Trinity is present with us, really and truly present, and each member in His own right and person. For Christ teaches that the Holy Spirit will be given to abide forever; no less clearly does He teach that He Himself will be present; and He also says that both He and the Father will come to His believing disciples and will make their abode with them. Where one person of the Godhead is the others are. If that were not so, there would be a disrupted Trinity—a tritheism instead of a tri-unity. Moreover, Christ must be present, not in His divine nature only, but also in His glorified human nature, or else we should have a divided Christ. But the Bible teaches that we are saved and comforted by the presence of the undivided Trinity and the undivided Christ. All of which is a profound truth and a blessed consolation.

Now, all we need to do is to study our Lutheran confessions and theologies to discern that they teach this same high and holy Biblical view of the person of Christ. Take several quotations from the Formula of Concord, whose comprehensive teaching on this doctrine has never been surpassed. We quote from page 518 of Jacobs' edition of the Book of Concord:

"Hence we believe, teach and confess that the Son of Man is really, that is, in deed and in truth, exalted, according to His human nature, to the right hand of the almighty majesty and power of God, because He was assumed into God when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost in His mother's womb, and His human nature was personally united with the Son of the Highest."

"This majesty, according to the personal union, He always had; and yet, in the state of His humiliation, He abstained from it, and on this account truly grew in all wisdom and favor with God and men; therefore He exercised this majesty, not always, but when it pleased Him; until, after His resurrection, He entirely laid aside the form of a servant, and not the nature, and was established in the full use, manifestation and declaration of the divine majesty, and thus entered into His glory (Phil. 2:6. sq.); so that now, not only as God, but also as man, He knows all things, can do all things, is present with all creatures, and has, under His feet and in His hands, everything that is in heaven and on earth and under the earth, as He Himself testifies (Matt. 28:18; John 13:3): 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' And St. Paul says (Eph. 4:10): 'He ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.' Everywhere present, He can exercise this His power, and to Him everything is possible and everything known.

"Hence, being present, He is able, and to Him it is very easy to impart His true body and blood in the Holy Supper, not according to the mode and property of the human nature, but according to the mode and property of the right hand of God; as Dr. Luther says in our Christian Faith for Children, which presence is not earthly or Capernaitic; nevertheless it is true and substantial, as the words of His testament sound: "This is, is, is my body,' etc.'"

From page 639 we quote again: "But we hold that by these words (the teaching of Holy Scripture) the majesty of the man Christ is declared, which Christ has received according to His humanity, at the right hand of the majesty and power of God—namely, that He also, according to His assumed human nature and with the same, can be and is present where He will, and especially that in His church and congregation on earth, as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest, He is not half present, or there is only the half of Him present, but the entire person of

Christ is present, to which two natures belong, the divine and the human; not only according to His divinity, but also according to and with His assumed human nature, by which He is our brother and we are flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone. For the certain assurance and confirmation of this, He has instituted His Holy Supper, that also according to our nature, by which He has flesh and blood, He will be with us, and in us dwell and be efficacious."

Quotations from both Luther and the Formula of Concord might be multiplied, but those given are clear and decisive. In all our great theologies, like those of Schmid, Martensen, Frank, and Luthardt, the same high and holy doctrine of Christ's person is taught. A faithful study of the Lutheran doctrine of the "*communicatio idiomatum*" will rectify any errors that may be held relative to the person of our Lord and His real immanence in the world. Indeed, it stands to reason that, if our humanity is to be redeemed and saved, it must be done by a real and vital contact with the resurrected and glorified humanity of our Lord, the true Federal Head of the race. This is what our Saviour meant when He said (John 6:54-56): "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." This eating and drinking is effected by the believer's mystical union with the glorified incarnate Redeemer.

The whole doctrine of the divine presence might be stated thus: The Father is present as Preserver and gracious heavenly Parent and eternal Source of grace. The Holy Spirit is present to awaken the sinner into life by His regenerating touch at the very center of man's personality, which is the human spirit, which must be revived and awakened in order to take hold upon redeeming grace. Then Christ in His whole theanthropic person is present, first, to pour out or baptize with the Spirit; second, to be the living Saviour, Friend, Companion, Sympathizer and Nourisher of the regenerated believer. All told, the contact of the Holy Trinity with the man of faith is direct, vital, constant, inspiring and redemptive. The believer is richly blessed. He is no orphan; he has a living, present Father. He cannot be lost; he has a living, present Saviour. He cannot be

"dead in trespass and sins;" he has a living, present Regenerator. The mystical union, begun by the spiritual birth by the Spirit, is a vital union with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

EXPOSITION OF LENT¹

BY REV. A. D. POTTS, D.D., PH.D.

Lent, in a general and unrestricted sense, dates its origin quite far back in the Christian era. From an ecclesiastical standpoint it takes its rise in both the Greek and Latin Churches from about the fourth century.

While the season of keeping a fast before Easter was more or less observed in that age, still we find a lack of uniformity in the practices of the different adherents. Some observers of the fast felt only the necessity of keeping one day, while others deemed it obligatory to keep two or more days. In the opinion of a Latin writer on the subject, it was incumbent on Christians to keep the fast religiously for a period covering the exact time that "the bridegroom was taken away from them." But even in the light of such a conception the practice was subject to variations; no consensus of opinion prevailed. Leo I laid stress on the 40 day period and claimed apostolic sanction for his interpretation. Such, indeed, were the divergent and unsettled views up till nearly the close of the eighth century. The manner of observing Lent in those early days was admissible of nearly as great a latitude as was the length of time considered necessary to a proper fulfilment of the same. That a certain degree of strictness in the observance was deemed essential to ecclesiastical life and progress, is a fact that can be gleaned from the special regulations exacted.

The catalogue embraced the following:

"Perfect abstinence from all food every fasting day until evening is in theory, at least, required, and it has been considered desirable that the public worship with sermon should be attended daily, with frequent communion, especially on Saturday and Sunday; public amusements, especially stage plays, are prohibited, and the celebration of the religious festivals, as also of

1. Read at the spring session of the Northeast Conference of the Alleghany Synod at Union Church in Huntingdon county, Pa., and furnished for publication in *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* by a unanimous vote of the brethren.

birthdays and marriages, is held undesirable; and increased diligence in almsgiving and deeds of charity is enjoined."

Having noted these general facts relative to the subject, it shall be my purpose to deal more particularly with Lent as viewed from a Lutheran standpoint. That the season is one of serious magnitude all sober-minded persons will readily admit, and that its true observance by our church members is a solemn and imperative duty must be accepted as a foregone conclusion.

The period in our regular church year brings us very closely in touch with the Passion life of our dear Lord, and reveals to us, in the most feeling manner, the agony of Him who endured all things that His loyal and sincere followers might be spared much suffering, and died triumphantly that men might have life more abundantly.

The word Lent, in itself, means spring.

As such, the season always comes in the spring of the year. As an interchangeable term, or one synonymous with it, we sometimes speak of the suffering period as the Passion-Season.

Passion, here, means suffering. The idea of a fast was connected with it. Abstinence from food was a stern requirement. The exact time embraced was seven weeks prior to Easter, and properly began with Ash Wednesday.

Ash Wednesday, as a starting point in Lent, was historically connected with the practice in vogue in Old Testament times when the priests sprinkled ashes upon the heads of the people, repeating the words, "Remember that thou art dust and ashes." This practice, at once, reminded the observers of the necessity of a condition of humility. Such a conception was not a foreign thought in the mind of our dear Lord who was entering upon one of the most lowly periods in His history from the manger to the grave.

It pointed back to the utterance of the prophet Isaiah who said, "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed."

Jesus, undoubtedly, realized the significant import of that prophetic utterance when He, having called together His twelve disciples, predicted His passion experience in these memorable words: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things

that are uttered by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. For He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on; and they shall scourge Him and put Him to death: and the third day He shall rise again."

What harmony between the Old and New Testaments on this point! Both prophesies were minutely and literally fulfilled.

The Lamb without spot or blemish was ready to be offered.

The awful crisis was at hand.

He who knew no sin was tasting sin for every man. However severe the ordeal, He faced it all. "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so He opened not His mouth: In His humiliation His judgment was taken away: and who shall declare His generation? for His life is taken from the earth." To particularize, I shall from this point proceed to discuss the theme synoptically by taking up in order the six Sundays constituting the Passion-Season, and then note the bearing that their true interpretations have on the life and character of the sincere participant.

According to the Lutheran division of the Lenten season, we denominate the six Sundays as follows: *Invocavit, Reminiscere, Oculi, Laetere, Judica, and Palmarum.*

While I have stated that the Lenten season properly begins with Ash Wednesday, still it may not be irrelevant to our subject to specify the Scripture lesson for the previous Sunday as an accurate and fitting introduction to the matter to be treated under the six Sundays of Lent proper.

Luke, in this particular lesson, truly gives us a clue to the entire history that must engage our attention. He furnishes us with the account of blind Bartimaeus who, though devoid of natural vision, yet possessed a sense of sight that enabled him to recognize the Passion Saviour.

We thank God that the blind man's ears were not dulled. He heard the commotion about him, and when he inquired as to its meaning, we are told that the crowd answered him by saying, "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by." Ah! indeed, that meant much to an anxious and needy soul.

Jesus passing by, and to what end?

Yes, passing by on His way to Jerusalem to suffer and die. What had that to do with a blind man at the wayside? What,

I ask, if not an opportunity to know the Lord of life and glory?

His own words confirm the truthfulness of the matter. Actuated by faith that will not shrink at the sight of poverty or woe, he cried, saying, "Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me."

The thoughtful and compassionate Saviour said to the blind petitioner, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" The blind man is quick to make his request for he knew what he needed, and that Jesus could bestow the favor. He said, "Lord, that I may receive my sight." The answer and the cure are at once given by the Saviour who says: "Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee."

And oh! the marvelous result. The blind man received his sight, and the wonder-working Jesus received the merited glory. And in every observance of the Lenten season the figure repeats itself. It foreshadows the need of sinners in calling upon the dear Lord and the ready deliverance that comes to immortal souls.

Jesus passing by in His journey of grace will stop to heal or take away our spiritual blindness if we only call upon Him, trust in Him, and give Him the glory due Him. Such close communion comes in our Lenten experiences. Let us, as contrite ones, say, "Sirs, we would see Jesus." When we are the neediest, Jesus is readiest to help.

In Him is infinite power and unending mercy. He will save unto the uttermost all that call upon Him in faith and humility. Before Him, too, the Devil trembles and the cohorts of hell flee.

This thought prepares us for the consideration of:

1. The First Sunday in Lent. (Invocavit).

The Gospel account supporting it is found in Matt. iv:1-11. In our study of the lesson we are brought face to face with one of the most touching episodes in the life of our dear Lord.

We have here, as principals in a tremendous conflict, the King of kings and the Arch-enemy of souls. Here we have Satan, with all the machinations of the infernal pit, trying might and main to despoil God's well-beloved Son.

In doing so he appeals to human nature through its wants as though physical necessities well met would prove to be the summum bonum of terrestrial life. The Devil saw fit to invert the logical order of sequence in his attack on Jesus.

His aim was to gain a victory over Christ by getting Him to work a miracle on stone to meet the pangs of bodily hunger. That the Devil was strategic in this instance must be admitted.

Had Christ complied in this particular, it would have been comparatively easy for Satan to succeed in the remaining trials to be made.

What Satan planned first in order, was bread, then trust, and then worship. Such was his schedule. Christ, however, invoked the authority of the Old Testament teaching to defeat His assailant.

He appealed to Deuteronomy, time and again, in His encounters with the Prince of Darkness. Christ showed the Devil that the order outlined in the present temptation was unscriptural.

The Word of God puts the Devil's first would-be test last, and his last requirement first.

The divine order is: *worship, trust, bread.*

It is written, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness: and all these things shall be added unto you." The Saviour's ready use of the Word of God throughout the entire temptation proved His familiarity with that Word and showed that His life was to be rounded out not by instantaneous acquiescence in the Devil's strategy, but by following conditions eternally fixed by "Thus saith the Lord."

In other words, Christ conquered Satan through the acknowledged authority of the Scriptures.

His quotations from Moses proved conclusively that man, after all, does not live by bread alone, however called into requisition, "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Christ, having resorted to such a method, easily defeated His wary antagonist. It is recorded, "Then the Devil leaveth Him." The victory was not only marvelous, but signally complete.

In man's conflict with the same satanic agency, nothing will serve him so well as the adroitness to invoke the conquering power of the Word of God.

Invoke the Word! It brought Christ's victory, and it will bring yours. It is mighty and will prevail. I will now notice:

2. The Second Sunday in Lent. (Reminiscere).

The Gospel basis, in this instance, is Matt. xv:21-28. Here,

as in our notice of the preceding lesson, Satan plays a conspicuous part.

He gets not only near humanity, but into it. He takes possession of a young girl and torments her grievously. How he gained possession we are not told. As long, however, as the damsel is under his influence she is neither well by nature, nor comfortable by grace.

But what is of grave moment in this connection is the fact the girl's mother is no small sufferer because of her daughter's predicament. Sympathy, deep and strong, must pervade the mother's nature when she is made to endure the privations and discomforts that hold her child in misery's chains. Sin, we might justly say, is contagious. It strives to embrace the major number rather than the minor one.

The sympathizing mother, in this instance, from maternal and natural bonds, enters deeply into her daughter's woes. The mother-heart is pained in the extreme and resolves to obtain help, not from the medical fraternity, but from the great Physician, who has at His command the true balm of Gilead. This forces through my mind a momentous thought. It makes me think of a real devil. Indeed, I believe in a personal devil, and I further believe that only a personal Christ can exorcise a personal devil.

Evil, to my mind, is no less an entity than is right or good. The evil in this case that made the mother full of sorrow and vexation was from the same source as that which made her child suffer. The startling fact was, like mother, like child. But why, it may be asked, did the mother suffer so intensely in this particular?

Why, if not because of a mother's love? We are told that it is the very "essence of all true love to suffer with and for the object of its love." What an application to the condition of needy souls does this mother-love teach us of Christ's love for sinful men and women?

The immaculate Jesus endured the acme of suffering in our behalf. It was love supreme on His part that induced Him to tread the wine-press alone, and to endure the agonies of dark Gethsemane and the cruel tortures of Calvary.

"He first loved us, and gave Himself for us." What the

woman of Canaan asked the blessed Master for herself, we must beseech Him to grant unto us.

She said, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David." The suffering Saviour alone can help and save the suffering sinner. Her plaint, "Lord, help me," touched the Saviour's loving heart, and He said, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that hour." So also was the mother. A similar petition must be ours in our sad plight, occasioned by sin's destructive ways. If man will only recognize THE CHRIST of life and glory, if he will only evidence to a recognition of Christ's compassionate love for mankind, if he will only appropriate Christ's grace offered through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and if he will only seek humbly, faithfully and believingly nothing but Christ's will, it shall be well with him in both time and eternity.

A Reminiscere Sunday teaches us that if we call upon the Lord while He is near, doubting nothing, we shall obtain mercy. The prophet Isaiah said, "Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength."

The Psalmist David gave a similar injunction when he said, "Trust in the Lord and do good: so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed. Delight thyself also in the Lord: and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart."

Commit thy ways unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.

And He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday."

Let us now notice:

3. The Third Sunday in Lent. (Oculi).

The foundation on which this consideration rests is found in Luke xi:14-28. Here, too, as in previous activities of our Lord, do we find the Evil One an opposing factor. In the first encounter Satan assailed our Lord directly, but in the second he choose a young girl to be possessed of him and proved himself to be her grievous tormentor. In this third instance, we find that Satan tenants himself once more in a human being and works great detriment to the person by rendering him dumb. The word EXIT had scarcely fallen from the Saviour's lips before a mighty change was wrought in the unhappy victim for his relief. The dumb immediately regained his power of speech

and used the same in witnessing to the wonder-working power of the Son of God.

But, the spirit of fault-finding was ready to operate at the same time. While some of the people wondered at the marvelous change so instantaneously wrought, still they thought it strange that He who proclaimed Himself to be the Messiah should not give a more elaborate demonstration of His Messiahship. Others, who had witnessed the same gracious work of Christ, were ready to criticise Him, and even went so far as to attribute to Him an alliance with Beelzebub the prince of devils. To have put Christ in league with an ordinary devil, had there been such, would have been base and nefarious enough, but when His critics meant to show that Christ and Beelzebub were in a hellish partnership the matter assumed a gravity that foreboded no little degree of wickedness. It, however, took but a moment for Christ to dislodge such illogical arguments and to distinctly show that Satan arrayed against Satan was not only a preposterous proposition to set on foot, but one that was contrary to the whole law of reasoning. If a house divided against itself could not stand, so it would follow, as a natural sequence, Christ declared, that a devil fighting a devil could not bring about such salutary results. The whole lesson, with its striking delineations, at once, shows us Christ's supremacy and Satan's crushing defeat.

Christ's kingdom must advance and finally stand. The Devil's kingdom, before the relentless charge of Christ's forces, must dwindle and fall.

Christ's victory whether over a subaltern, or even Beelzebub himself, is complete and final.

It takes away from the Devil all the armor in which he trusted. It not only breaks the spear, but crushes the head of the foe.

It has been said, "The Devil is a confident adversary; he trusts to his armor, as Pharoah to his rivers; but Christ disarms him. When the power of sin and corruption in the soul is broken, when the mistakes are rectified, the eyes opened, the heart humbled and changed, and made serious and spiritual, then Satan's armor is taken away."

The Despoiler is despoiled, and the suffering Saviour and His kingdom are gloriously triumphant. Sin must be eliminated from the heart and life, and grace, truth, and righteousness must

dwell therein. Where Christ and His sublime truth dwell, the Devil soon quits his palace.

He does not always wait to be thrust out, but, as in the case of the dumb man, he elects to go out.

Man, in his unregenerate state, is with Satan, and against Christ. The Saviour said, "He that is not with Me, is against Me: and he that gathereth not with Me, scattereth abroad."

God and man reconciled is victory over hell and Satan. Our next consideration is:

4. The Fourth Sunday in Lent. (*Laetare*).

The corresponding gospel is found in John vi:1-15. In the development of this topic we are confronted by the stern truth that mankind, in its ruined and alienated state, seeks material things to the exclusion of spiritual gifts.

The old story of loaves and fishes repeats itself over and over again. The earthly, with its fluctuations and transitory pleasures, clings to men in their daily experiences. Christ realized this most painfully in His day, and was ready to rebuke the misguided devotees. He said to the masses, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek Me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed." By way of supplement, He added the significant words, "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger: he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."

He also said, "I am that bread which came down from heaven." How truly must the heart rejoice when it perceives that God's well-beloved Son gave up His life in death that thousands and tens of thousands of soul-an-hungered ones might have the Bread of Life. The cup of joy is made to everflow when immortal souls realize that Jesus came to "furnish the bread for the soul, the meat that perisheth not, the life eternal, heaven for this poor unheavenly world." Those, we believe, who look simply to Christ for material blessings will, in the end, be sad, but those who come to Him for spiritual nourishment will be eternally happy and rich. Soul-life needs soul-food, and 'tis Jesus alone who can supply the essential want. David said, "Our soul waiteth for the Lord: He is our help and shield. For

our heart shall rejoice in Him, because we have trusted in His holy name. Let Thy mercy, O Lord, be upon us, according as we hope in Thee."

We now come to consider:

5. The Fifth Sunday in Lent. (Judica).

The Gospel lesson for this Sunday is found in John viii:6-59. Here, again, we are cognizant of the fact that not only devils, but men, inspired by devilish motives, love to taunt and deride the Son of God. In His day it was a common thing to pile the most abusive epithets upon the sacred head of the Lord Jesus Christ. Because He cut to the quick, with the sword of the Spirit, His avowed enemies, the most rancorous abuse shot its arrows into His unblemished life.

Never, in the history of the world, was anyone so bitterly and unjustly maligned as the innocent Saviour. As the night brings out the stars, so also did unwarranted accusations on the part of Christ's foes bring Him more and more to the notice of seeking souls. The jeers of His assailants proved in turn to be tributes to His matchless and spotless character. Because Christ told the Jews of their alienation from the commonwealth of true Israel, they sought to brand Him as an enemy to His race. They stigmatized Him as such when they said, "Thou art a Samaritan."

Judica Sunday tells who and what Christ is.

It accounts accurately for His personality and sinless life. Jesus told the scoffing Jews of His day that He was neither a Samaritan nor the dwelling place of a devil. He further said as to the eternity of His existence, "Before Abraham was, I am." This citation was too much for them and it sorely angered them. To show the volume of their animosity it is said, "Then took they up stones to cast at Him."

But all this shameful treatment did not in the least disconcert the adorable Lord.

He employed the ascending scale of argument and made stronger and stronger allegations in His behalf. He declares not only His unique character to be well established by the wonderful works wrought in their presence, but pointedly asserts an unbroken equality with the Creator of heaven and earth. Indeed, He considers it not robbery to be equal with God, and proves His true relationship by declaring, "I and my Father are

one." He told His accusers plainly that they misjudged Him and that they would be called to account for their injustice. He threw the judicial act upon the heart of His Father when He said, "And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth." The question comes home solemnly to all of us in these words, "What think ye of Christ?" We must decide the momentous interrogation sooner or later.

The bliss or woe of our eternity depends on the solution of the vital problem. Not only must the Bible tell us who Christ is, but we, as inheritors of eternal life, are called upon to give a reason for the faith and hope within us.

We are men, and Christ asks, "Whom do men say that I am?" In helping to put the Jews to shame who said that Christ was a Samaritan, let us, in the language of Peter, say, "Thou art the Christ: the Son of the living God," and declare with Thomas, "My Lord, and my God." We must proclaim Him to be our Christ. Indeed, He is a personal Christ; He is each man's Christ. "The tree of life stands in the middle of the garden that all may have equal access to it. Is this universal Christ yours; thine? Take Him for yours and you will find that each who possesses Him, possesses Him altogether, and none hinders the other in his full enjoyment of the bread of God which came down from heaven." We now notice:

6. The Sixth Sunday in Lent. (Palmarum).

The Gospel teaching in this instance is recorded in Matt. xxi: 1-9. Palmarum Sunday properly begins the Holy or Passion week of our Lord's closing earthly history. At this time He was nearing some of the most momentous events the world ever heard of. Having begun His memorable journey to Jerusalem, according to our Lenten chronology, we find Him nigh unto that city wherein should be enacted the culminating features of His terrestrial life. As He approached His earthly destiny, He appears to us as the same lowly Jesus of the past. His humiliation is marked by the absence of any worldly glamour or national ostentation. The choosing of an ass, a lowly beast of burden, was entirely in keeping with His plain and unpretentious character.

Men of state and warriors could select prancing horses on which to appear in national pageantry, or ride into fierce battles,

but Jesus, the mightiest conqueror of the ages, was satisfied with what was deemed an almost despised mode of travel.

Had He so elected He could have chosen a cherub to carry Him into the kingly city, or had He asserted His eternal prerogative of power He might have ridden on the very heavens, but, as our Immanuel, He saw fit to make His triumphal entry on a borrowed ass. Here, He evidently teaches men the noble lesson of true contentment in what they can command, and sets aside preconceived notions of coveted notoriety. If He was pleased to adapt Himself to humble surroundings and to use apparently despised facilities in order to accomplish His fixed purpose, so also must His zealous followers be content in whatsoever conditions they find themselves, even amid the blandishments of their useful lives. The borrowed ass marked the special feature in His eventful life known as poverty.

St. Paul emphasized this truth when he said, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." It has been said, "They that live on borrowing, live on sorrowing." Truly, Christ was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.

But His humiliation was, after all, really a stepping stone to His exaltation. In this, He has left us an example. By virtue of our condition through the fall of the human race, we must realize our poverty in things that make for our eternal welfare. Poverty in the realm of grace reveals to us our need of grace.

Devoid of inherent righteousness, we must be ready to take over Christ's imputed righteousness.

Even now, we must humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God's rulings, so as to be exalted in the coming time to His right hand in glory

Humiliating, indeed, as Christ's entry into Jerusalem was, because of His chosen mode of ingress it was nevertheless distinguished by certain attendant circumstances that made it signally triumphant. The honor conferred upon Him by the multitudes casting their garments and strewing palm branches in His way, and in shouting "Hosanna to the Son of David," gave prominence and emphasis to the declaration, "Vox populi, Vox Dei."

If the multitudes in Christ's time honored Him by their out-

ward demonstrations, as already noted, does it not become us, in an age of spiritual enlightenment and privilege, to crown Him the Lord of all by "welcoming Him, His grace, and His Gospel into our hearts?" It surely can be no mean procedure on our part to strew the palm branches of love, fidelity, and service in Christ's pathway through this wilderness world of sin when we are assured that He will, in His kingdom of glory, be pleased to place crowns of diadems on our heads and palms of victory in our hands.

In concluding our very interesting and instructive subject, it occurs to me that no Church in Christendom to-day has a higher purer, and truer conception of Lent than the Lutheran Church.

She ever stands squarely on the fundamental truths underlying the whole subject matter, and continually guards against any innovations that would detract from a proper observance of so sacred a season. It has been her pleasure and duty to conserve the gracious doctrine embodied in the teachings of God's Word in connection with this particular period of our Church Year.

She accentuates most distinctly the truth that a true keeping of the Lenten season must logically deepen spiritual life on the part of her members. Indeed, in view of her attitude on this matter, it is not saying too much when we declare that Protestantism owes the Lutheran Church an everlasting debt of gratitude and just recognition on account of her determination to keep the ecclesiastical cycle from being merged into a broad and conspicuous Revivalism, on the one hand, or a coarse Externalism, on the other hand.

The Saviour's journey to the cross was too solemn and soul-touching a period in His life to allow a slipshod or go-as-you-please observance of the facts connected with it to minimize the deep sacrificial and redemptive lessons to be taught.

I, for one, cannot tolerate the popular "evangelistic," or revivalistic tendency of our day in some places to push the time-honored evangelical view of Lent into the background. Neither can I accept the practice of Romanism, or blatant Ritualism with any less degree of denunciation.

The season is really one of too great seriousness, solemnity and far-reaching benefits to have it dragged in the mire of rabid rationalism and mere ceremonialism. The spiritual rather than the ethical must take the precedence and go on till it eventuates

in the ready acceptance of Christ's terrible sufferings and meritorious death as the only medium of mankind's redemption.

Sin and grace, in this instance, stand in near relationship. "Two main pillars support the majestic temple of divine revelation, and they are the sin of man and the grace of God."

Because sin has wrought its fearful havoc among the ranks of men, does the necessity of grace follow. The poor sinner, being heavily weighted with his sorrow for sin, and being hungry and thirsty for the bread and water of eternal life, finds himself spiritually refreshed by entering willingly into the conditions that God has made possible for him, in and through His loving plan of salvation. Thus it was that I saw fit to take up so fully and to elaborate so largely the corresponding Scripture lessons in connection with the six successive Sundays belonging to the Lenten season. "It is Lent's passion that inspires the Christian's response. Let us love Him who first loved us. . . . Jesus will teach us how to live and how to die,—yes, and how to rise again that we may inherit eternal life."

How markedly opposed, then, to the idea that Lent is a season of rest and recuperation, is our conception of Lent as a period of *spiritual refreshment*. Recently I read some words in one of our great city papers that made me wonder whether we were to so forget the true idea of Lent as to find no other use for it save the matter of rest and recuperation. That paper, in explaining the need of Lent, saw fit to say that Lent was "almost as necessary to the continued vitality of society as the one day in seven."

Such a low and distorted view of the observance of the Lenten season most assuredly emphasizes the human side of the individual and allows man's spiritual nature to get along as best it can. Poor, tired humanity that has been for a time in the whirl of society's maze and feels itself quite weary from long engagements in social functions must, according to this pseudo and modern conception of Lent, have the precious hours of the blessed Passion Season of our dear Lord for mere respite from toil and the chances of recuperation.

Alas! what a travesty upon the highest ideal of true life, as well as upon that portion of time commemorative of the dear Saviour's sad hours spent in going up to Jerusalem to meet His awful doom.

We earnestly beseech God to keep us from entertaining such a base notion and from practicing such a vain and shameful delusion.

If the Lenten season savors of anything in the line of rest, it must be of that kind that the sincere and contrite sinner enjoys and receives when, weary of sin's load, he heeds the blessed Saviour's invitation which says, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me: for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest for your souls." Thus, then, we observe that the Lenten season properly and sincerely kept is a time of rich and gracious opportunities.

Indeed, they are golden opportunities to bring men to a profound knowledge of their sins and to show them the only way of escape. It has been well said in commenting upon our Lenten opportunities that "one must be a better Christian for the rest of the year, if one, during the Lenten time, will enrich his intelligence with Christian truth, will invigorate his will by sturdy living, will fire his heart with heavenly love."

We may in the silence of the closet, get nearer to our heavenly Father; we may understand more deeply, the Passion of Jesus; we may in daily prayer and service, consecrate our thoughts, our affections, and our deeds to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Thus we may grow into His image.' "What an incentive to correct living does the season furnish! "By faithfulness in Lenten duties we gather strength and grace to go on to better things, when the light of Easter morning breaks through the mists, and the Sunshine of Eternal Hope falls upon an empty tomb."

As a fitting peroration to all that I have said on the subject assigned me, I would like to quote the following poem on Lent.

Now, in the passage of the year,
Cometh the time to Christians dear,
Time to reflect, confess, repent—
The hallowed forty days of Lent.

My Saviour by the Spirit driven,
Used these dear days in thoughts on heaven,
Wrung Truth from dreary desert sand,
Conquered my foe with dauntless hand.

Thus Jesus kept His Lent, and then
Age after age of holy men
Have used thee, Oh dear season blest!
Their prayers have made, their sins confessed.

And shall not I observe these days
And turn from earth awhile my gaze?
Christ and the Church say 'Heed! Repent!'
I'll keep—as Jesus did—my Lent.' ”

Petersburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

KARL MARX.

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

Professor Vablen has rightly said: "The socialism that inspires hopes and fears to-day is of the school of Marx. No one is seriously apprehensive of any other so-called socialistic movement, and no one is seriously concerned to criticise or refute the doctrines set forth by any other school of 'Socialists.'" John Spargo who has given us the first adequate biography of Marx says, "In the great European countries where Socialism is a power politically, the movement is almost wholly dominated and inspired by the thought and deed of Marx. In the United States, where there is a growing Socialistic movement which is generally recognized as being much bigger and stronger than its political manifestation, Socialism and Marxism are synonymous. In China and Japan the works of Marx are eagerly read and studied by those who challenge the existing order and who dream of change. In Australia Marxian shibboleths are inscribed upon the red-banners of a discontented proletariat. In Africa there are Karl Marx clubs, from which emanate the spirit of revolution."

The personality and work of such a man, then, must have an interest for all students of social and political life.

His work *Das Kapital* is known by many, the man himself is not only slightly known but has been grossly misrepresented. This paper does not pretend to be more than a compilation, often using the very words of Mr. Spargo in his able presentation of the life of Marx. Marx's parents, Heinrich Marx and Henrietta Pressburg, lived at Trenis or Trier, as it is now called in the Province of the Rhine. It had been under Prussian rule but four years at the time of his birth, May 5th, 1818. The French Revolution had done much to break down mediaeval laws and customs. Heinrich Marx was a Jewish lawyer of social standing culture and force. He was intellectually a disciple of Voltaire Rousseau and Lessing. On the other hand he was a genuine Prussian patriot. This combination of liberalism and patriot-

ism prepared him for his change of faith. He deplored the revolutionary tendencies of his son in later days. When Karl was six years old his father embraced the Christian religion—at least he renounced Judaism as confining and anti-social in its attitude and claimed the large freedom and progressive spirit of German Protestantism. This step was not taken under compulsion as most of his biographers claim but out of his own free choice. Economically, the Jews, for the most part, remained after the Napoleonic regime what they were, a race of money lenders and usurers. Young Marx saw later that real liberty for the Jews was to be found in the emancipation of the Jew from himself, from this “practical Judaism”—from money and business. He agreed with Heine that Luther’s battle hymn, “*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*,” was “the Marseillaise of the Reformation.” Heinrich Marx was much more a typical Frenchman than a typical Jew. His mother was a simple, goodnatured soul of the domestic type with no particular intellectual gifts. Of all her children Karl alone manifested any special intelligence. He early manifested his intellectual aptness. His father died when Karl was twenty years of age. His mother lived until 1863 all through the worst period of her son’s struggle. Every step he took in his revolutionary career filled her heart with pain and terror.

The grave lawyer father given to philosophic study was ready to give himself to the guidance and companionship of his promising boy. He discussed with Karl as soon as he was able to read the writings of Racine and Voltaire. Karl was a strong, imperious lad and required the conservative temper of his father to hold in check his own passionate, poetic, wayward temperament. Baron von Westphalen, half Scot, stood next in influence to the father of the spirited boy. Von Westphalen’s charming daughter Jenny was the playmate of young Sophie Marx. From boyhood Karl was charmed by her winsome manner and devoted spirit. This early attachment ripened later into love and she finally became his courageous and devoted wife. Von Westphalen read Goethe, Lessing, Cervantes, Shakespeare and Dante to the eager and ambitious group of children making up the congenial household. Such was his early home training. No wonder then that he soon showed at school remarkable aptitude and interest in the studies usually set for young pupils. He was

full of fun, boistrous and with a vein of raillery and sarcasm that made him feared by his fellow schoolmates. But he was generous and daring of heart and won many friends. Handsome and beloved his mother called him her "fortune child." He was graduated from the Trier Gymnasium at sixteen years of age. His great capacity for planning extensive work with thoroughness and his marked superiority in Greek and Latin studies were noted in his school report.

With this equipment Karl Marx entered the University of Bonn. He had much difficulty in deciding upon a career. His mind leaned toward philosophic study and romantic literature. To please his father, however, he took up the study of jurisprudence. But his heart was not in his work and he had but indifferent success as a student of law. Indeed, he was a distinct disappointment to his father and Baron Von Westphalen whose own son Edgar, fifteen years older than Karl had made such a distinct success in public life and had become a Minister of State. Karl complained of the method of teaching at Bonn and plead to be sent to Berlin where jurisprudence was well taught. No doubt his burning love for Jenny Von Westphalen who was rich and four years older than Karl disturbed his mind and heart unfitting him for hard and continuous study. He returned home after a disappointing year at Bonn and then went to Berlin leaving his heart in Jenny's keeping. He had, of course, nothing to offer her in the way of support but he pushed his suit so hard that she yielded to his entreaties and they became engaged secretly. He was matriculated at Berlin in October, 1836, being then a little over eighteen years of age. The glory of the departed Hegel's career was still overshadowing the University. Ludwig Feuerbach had preached there the philosophy of humanitarian religion, whose *Wessen des Chrsienthums* profoundly influenced the development of Marx as may be seen from Engel's *Die Heilige Familie*. David Strauss, author of the Life of Jesus was another Berlin figure of power. But the influence of the philosophy of Hegel was undergoing a change. A new school of naturalist philosophers under the leadership of Alexander Von Humboldt had appeared. It was not long before the Hegelian metaphysic proved unsatisfactory to Marx and he sought in history and science the satisfaction of his mind. The truth is that he studied only a little more successfully at Berlin

than he did at Bonn looking upon jurisprudence as "a necessary evil." He was in an emotional and intellectual storm, for Jenny Von Westphalen had refused to correspond with him secretly. He wrote again and again to her but his impassioned letters provoked no reply. It was only through Sophie Marx that he learned of his sweetheart's condition. His father sympathized with both the young lovers and urged Karl to make a place for himself so that the "girl angel" might be free to respond to his son's impetuous desires. Jenny's parents finally consented to the engagement. He writes, "Give my best wishes to my sweet and beautiful Jenny. I have re-read her letter twelve times, and every time I find a new charm in it. It is in every respect, even in style, the finest letter I have ever received from a lady." He wrote poetry and planned the writing of a number of novels. He translated the *Germania* of Tacitus and Ovid's *Libri Tristium*. It was a period of storm and stress and his health broke down. The spiritual struggle was on and he determined to fight his way into the open and secure calm if possible. His father wrote in strong and commanding language that he should concentrate his mind upon something definite and practical or he would make shipwreck of life and crush the heart of his affianced bride. Karl went home at Easter and was present at his father's death-bed in 1838. Karl loved his father but they had come to a parting of the ways. He worshipped his father's memory but could not accept his point of view of life. In his agony of soul he turned once more to Hegel and joined himself to the "Young Hegelians" and found relief in new friendships and intellectual interests. Marx himself has said that the Young Hegelians found that the dialectic method of Hegel, in order to be rationally employed, had to be turned upside down and placed upon a materialistic basis, and the saying fairly describes the aims and results of their work. Hegel's thought was essentially revolutionary. "All that is real is rational, and all that is rational is real." Hegel's doctrine, as applied to the Prussian State, did not mean that it was real and therefore rational, as implying approval of its existence. What it meant was that so long as it was *necessary* it was reasonable; that if a government exists in spite of what seems evil and unrational in its existence it is due to the faults in the subjects, which faults make its existence necessary. In other words, instead of approving the Prussian

State, Hegel virtually said, "Prussian government is as good as Prussians deserve." Hegel's philosophy gave recognition to the inevitability of the historic process of evolution, of growth. In the course of progress the reality of yesterday becomes the unreality of to-day or to-morrow; it loses its necessity, which is at once its right to existence and necessity.

Truth is not to be regarded as a fixed quantity, unchanging, to be conveniently compressed into formulae, but rather the process of knowledge itself. It will be seen later that the Hegelian philosophy was a necessary approach to Marxism. Still Hegel was far from reaching the modern Marxist point of view. Hegel was essentially an ideologist. According to his view, behind the great historical process and development is the Absolute Idea, existing from eternity, and the progression itself is simply the process of the Absolute.

The "Young Hegelians" combated this idea. Instead of regarding the logical forms as being due to a self-revealing Absolute, they regarded them as being due to human thought. Feuerbach boldly rejected Hegel's concept of the Absolute Idea and placed materialism on the throne again without circumlocution. The senses, he declared to be the sole sources of knowledge. He revamped the bold materialism of the eighteenth century. Marx was greatly influenced by Feuerbach's thought but he saw that man's influence upon nations and society also had to be reckoned with. He could not swallow the dictum "Der Mensch ist was er isst"—that man is what he eats. But both Hegel and Feuerbach were permanent intellectual influences—steps if you please, to his own final philosophy. There can be no true understanding of Marx's political and economic beliefs, however, if we forget that his fundamental philosophy was materialistic. Bruno Bauer his friend, had removed to Bonn and kept urging young Marx to complete his examinations and secure the degree of doctor of philosophy. The desultory study of the Young Hegelian and his dislike of detail made it difficult for the young genius to concentrate his mind and time for such an end. But he pulled himself together and prepared a thesis upon the Epicurean philosophy which was both radical and controversial in its character. Bauer feared that the essay would not meet with any consideration at the hands of the Berlin faculty. His paper was sent finally to Jena and he received his diploma of doctor of philosophy from that university on Oct. 15th, 1841. Within

a few weeks of Marx's graduation Bauer's work, *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, appeared and precipitated a crisis. Eichhorn, the Minister of Education, at once instituted a policy of academic repression in all German universities and very soon afterwards Bauer's license to teach was revoked. This was a severe blow to Marx. An academic career at Bonn or elsewhere was now out of the question. What could he do?

Marx now turned to political journalism for his livelihood. *The Rhenische Zeitung*, the most radical of the bourgeois newspapers, became the medium for the expression of his discontent and protestations against the existing regime. In 1842 he was made editor in chief having Bauer, Koppin, Max Stirner and George Herwegh as contributors. He addressed himself to a propaganda for the freedom of the press. This constant criticism of the established censorship provoked the government to suppress the *Rhenische Zeitung* in March, 1843. In the summer of 1843 he married Jenny Von Westphalen and after a brief honeymoon the young couple went to Paris. They were warmly welcomed by his earlier friend Arnold Ruge, editor of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, Heinrich Heine the poet, Michael Bakunin the philosophical anarchist, and Pierre Proudhon, the anarchist philosopher, and Cabet the famous Utopist, were fellows in the social circle. Proudhon's severely critical attitude toward the Utopian Socialism of Fourier and Saint Simon helped Marx to a clear definition of his own position. Saint Simonian teaching had, however, a tremendous influence upon Marx though he found its religious mysticism nauseating. Fourier also had a sympathetic influence on the young radical. Marx was moving towards that conception of the French Revolution which made it a conflict of two economic classes rather than a mere political struggle between nobility and bourgeoisie. About this time Marx wrote for the *Deutsche-Französische Jahrbücher* a criticism of Hegel's *Philosophy of Law*. In it he clearly formulates his materialistic conception, or rather his economic interpretation, of history. It was in September 1844 that Marx met for the first time the man whose name and deeds are inseparably interwoven with his own—Friedrich Engels. Born and educated in Germany he had been sent to England to take charge of a factory owned by his father's firm. He became immediately interested

in the Chartist movement and became a friend of the aged Robert Owen. He made a careful study of the industrial conditions in England and on his return to Germany he published in 1845 his book *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. The book stands to this day a classic example of sociological analysis and description. Engels and Marx were kindred spirits. They both had outgrown the attitude of the mere "dogmatism" of the socialistic virtues and were bent on political action. But their intense friendship went deeper than their economic convictions. There was a personal affinity due to psychical and temperamental contrasts. Marx was stout, Engels tall and thin; Marx was so dark that he was called "The Negro" by his friends; Engels was a pronounced blonde. Engels was cool and balanced in temperament, Marx was fiery and impulsive. They possessed complementary tastes, gifts and habits. Their friendship was truly romantic. Together they made a well rounded whole. The magazine venture proved a failure and there appeared in Paris a new journal the *Vorwärts* to meet the needs of German liberal thinkers resident in France. Marx became editor of the newspaper. The Prussian government grew restive under its attacks and requested Guizot to suppress *Vorwärts*. Marx was expelled from France and journeyed with his young wife and child to Brussels. The young couple found themselves painfully embarrassed for lack of money. Engels learning of their plight sent them a substantial remittance which kept the wolf from the door for a short time.

Engels was then at Elberfeld rejoicing in the communistic movement among the workingmen. In the summer of 1845 Engels, accompanied by Marx, returned to England. Here Marx made his first acquaintance with the writings of the English Radicals of the Ricardian School which exercised such a profound influence upon his thought and work. Marx read the brief outline of Engels' own criticism of political economy and gorged himself in the libraries of Manchester and elsewhere. They returned to Brussels in 1845 and wrote in collaboration their critique of the Hegelian philosophy. But more to the point they established connections with the radical Democrats of the city and Marx became the vice-president of the Democratic Society. They organized a German Workingmen's Club—a sort of labor union and secured control of the *Deutsche Brüsseler*

Zeitung. They now sought to reach the working classes themselves, the proletariat of Europe in general and of Germany in particular. Marx devoted much time to economic studies, lectured occasionally, taught classes of workmen the elements of political economy. He was a born teacher. Not only was he wonderfully patient and kind, contrary to the accepted view, but he possessed to a degree that was quite remarkable the ability to make the most abstract and abstruse matters clear and interesting to the ordinary untrained mind. His patience, however, was limited only to the industrious student. About this time appeared Proudhon's *La Philosophie de la Misere*. Though Marx and Proudhon had been friends the former did not hesitate to attack it in a pamphlet with the counter-title *La Misere de la Philosophie* which forever shattered the friendship of the two men. His reply is noteworthy as giving us a full statement of his materialistic conception of history. History must be interpreted in the light of economic development—this is his thesis and he brought the result of all his English reading to the task of exposing the fallacy of the "eternal laws" of Proudhon. Marx was opposed to Utopian colonizations in foreign lands and the *secret* insurrectionary movements for the overthrow of political masters. He would carry his fight for the working forces of the world into the open and establish the reign of right and justice on his native soil. An international alliance had been broached. The first meeting of its leaders took place in 1847 in the rooms of the Arbiter Buildings, in Great Treadwell street, London. Marx was not present preferring to remain in Brussels. Immediate and successful revolution Marx considered chimerical. He believed in the slower process of education and thorough preparation before the transformation was possible. The friends of Engels and Marx finally got control of the meeting and the Marxist principles were adopted. The League was known as the *Communist League*. The words Communist and "Socialist" had contrary meanings from that attached to them to-day. Then the plans of the Utopian schemers were called "Socialism," the working class movements "Communism." Marx opposed the over-sea colony in Texas proposed by Cabet then in Paris on the grounds of its impracticability. A second congress of the *League* was held in London in November in 1847. Marx attended this meeting accompanied by Engels.

The great leader prepared a carefully framed program which he was desirous the League should adopt as its principles and program of action. It was the first draft of the now famous *Manifesto*. This paper was read by Marx with great passion of voice and gesture and made a profound impression and was received with enthusiasm. Marx, with Engels as lieutenant, now became the leaders of the movement—the one thirty and Engels twenty-eight years of age. They made their headquarters once more at Brussels. On the day the revolution broke out in Paris, the birth cry of modern Socialism was heralded in the printed *Manifesto* written by Marx—"Workingmen of all Countries Unite."

And now we must summarize the main declarations of the *Manifesto* if we are to understand latter-day Socialism, for the *Communist Manifesto* is the Declaration of Independence of the working classes of Europe. Only a few of its leading tenets can be presented here.

The modern Bourgeois Society that has sprouted from the ruins of the feudal society has not done away with class antagonism. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat." He was just to the good accomplished by the Bourgeoisie regime. "The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together." But, he goes on to say, "Modern bourgeoisie society with its relations of production, of exchange, and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the forces of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more and more threateningly, the entire existence of bourgeois society." The *Manifesto* then pictures the rise of the proletarian class. The "Iron law of wages" is no doubt overworked in his account of the rise of the employing and employed

classes but his main contention of the dependence and suberviency of the employed to the capitalistic group is clearly outlined. Capitalism depends upon wage-labor, and wage-labor, in turn depends upon competition among the laborers. The grouping of men in labor unions accomplishes much, but to Marx the real value of the collective harmony is the spirit of solidarity bred in the workers. This prepares them to act as a political force and as a great political party. The revolution must be accomplished by the proletariat. But Marx knew that no social movement could ever be confined absolutely to a single class. The movement would carry with it and needed sections of the bourgeoisie and some of the noble-minded leaders of the older regime. The *Manifesto* reads:

"In the conditions of the proletariat, those of the old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletariat is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labor, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests." In the second section of the *Manifesto* we read "All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historic change, consequent upon the change in historical conditions.... The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is, based on class antagonisms, or the exploitation of the many by the few In this sense the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." The *Manifesto* disclaims the intention of taking from the laborer the product of his own toil. "There is no need to abolish that," says the *Manifesto*, "the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it and is still destroying it daily." "Does wage-labor create any property for the laborer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i. e., that kind of property which exploits wage-labor, and which cannot increase except on condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labor for

fresh exploitation." Marx then goes into a discussion of the nature of capital and wage labor. Concerning the family the *Manifesto* declares "The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child becomes all the more disgusting, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor. Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and this at most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women." The matter of nationalism and patriotism is then taken up. The *Manifesto* says, "The workingmen have no country.... Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class in the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is so far itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word..... The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and generally, from an ideological standpoint are not deserving of serious examination..... What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have been the ideas of its ruling class. The *Manifesto* closes with this proposed program.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with the State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the whole country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production."

Marx starts in with Locke's idea that the basis of property is labor, and works out a theory that in the evolution of society, the employing class has come to appropriate the surplus earnings of labor. This with his consideration of society as an evolution are the two most important and influential ideas of *Das Kapital* issued in 1867. The *Manifesto* which we have considered was much more radical than the later exposition of his ideas, but he believes in the inevitable assumption by the laboring class of the means of production and distribution. This is not the place to enter into a critique of Socialism. Suffice it to say that Marx lived to see the error of some of his prognostications especially the sudden rise of revolutionary conflict due to the rapid development of the two classes, employing and employed. His work was born in a revolutionary period and this storm and stress period of German and French history gave color to his prophecy. He was mistaken in his diagnosis of his age but his program for reorganization of the industrial and political state is as vital as ever.

At present we must address ourselves to his life rather than his teachings. The overthrow of the French monarch, Louis Philippe, in 1847, and the rise of a provisional government, a republic to be ratified by popular vote was the occasion for the violent agitation and demands of the working class. The "Crowing of the Gallican Cock" was heard throughout Europe. Marx was not deceived by the revolution for he saw that it was bourgeois rather than proletarian in its character. George Herwegh conceived the idea of carrying the revolution into Germany with a body of his excited fellow countrymen. Marx discouraged any such foolhardy escapade. What could such a legion do against the Prussian army? The Chartist movement in England blazed forth once more ending in the pathetic fiasco of the 10th of April. In Vienna the people were in revolt against their government. Metternich was deserted for his misrepresentation

of the Paris revolution. In Cologne a former artillery officer, August von Willich, led a mob into the council chamber and demanded that the municipality as a whole petition the King for freedom, for constitutional government. In Berlin there had been an outbreak. All night a battle raged. Marx and Engels remained in Paris. They welcomed the revolution, not because they entertained the false hope that the mere destruction of reactionary governments would bring about any great social change, but because they realized that it was a necessary, preliminary condition for the development of a class-conscious proletariat movement such as they were seeking to develop. Marx was present at the Democratic congress held in Cologne in 1848, but his contemptuous manner toward all those who differed from him lost instead of gained friends for his ultimate political program. So he appeared at least to the youthful Carl Schurz, though others considered him patient in the propagation of his ideas. Marx was expelled from Prussia and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* suppressed. Marx and his family had suffered many hardships during their fight against society and despotism. As soon as he was expelled from Prussia, Marx hastened to Paris. He reached Paris in May and as soon as his family was settled he devoted himself to the discharge of the commission with which the Rhenish Democrats had entrusted him. The anticipated uprising was a failure and soon a sergeant stood at Marx's door announcing his expulsion from Paris. With his family he turned his face toward London—"the Mother of Exiles." It should be noted here that Mrs. Marx was not left alone with her children upon such journeys or occasions. With her always went her faithful companion, Helene Demuth, the noble "Lenchen" of whom we shall hear more. She had grown up in the household of the Westphalens as one of the family, treating little Jenny and her playmate, Karl as her own sister and brother. Marx arrived in London toward the end of June 1849, and took furnished lodgings somewhere in the Camberwell district of the city. Into this state of poverty came in July the fourth child, a boy, named Henry, doomed to early death like so many children of the poor. A German radical had a hard time to find work in the English metropolis. Marx wrote a few articles for the Chartist journals but probably received not a penny in payment. Marx as we know had no sympathy with "secret"

and "shady" political propagandas and his position, now, among the hot-heads of the revolutionary movement was a peculiar one. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was revived through its old friends and was edited by Marx in London. The domestic situation of the Marx family was more than distressing. In a letter written by the refined and gentle wife of the proud and courageous propagandist of Socialism—a letter laying bare to an intimate friend their unbearable plight she says, "I will describe to you only one single day of this life, and you will see that very few fugitives have gone through similar experiences. The keeping of a wet nurse for my baby was out of question, so I resolved to nurse the child myself, in spite of constant terrible pains in the breast and back. But the poor little angel drank so much silent worry from me that he was sickly from the first day of his life, lying in pain day and night..... In those pains he drew so hard that my breast got sore and broke open; often the blood streamed into his little wavering mouth. So I was sitting one day, when unexpectedly our landlady stepped in, to whom we had paid 250 thalers during the winter, and with whom we had a contract to pay, after that, the rent to the owner of the house. She denied the contract and demanded five pounds, the sum we owed for rent, and because we were unable to pay at once two constables stepped in and attached my small belongings, beds, linen, clothes, all, even the cradle of my poor baby and the toys of the two girls, who stood by crying bitterly..... The next day we had to get out of the house. It was cold, rainy and gloomy. My husband was out hunting for rooms. In the end a friend helped us..... We were able, after the selling of everything we possessed, to pay every cent. I moved with our little ones into our present two small rooms in the German Hotel, 1, Leicester street, Leicester Square, where we have found a week's shelter and board for five and one-half pounds.... Do not believe these petty sufferings have bent us.... But what strikes me the hardest and causes my heart to bleed is that my husband has to endure so many petty annoyances while he could be helped with so very little and that he, who is willing and with pleasure, has helped so many, stands here so helpless and nobody to help him." Such was the bitter and tragic situation of Marx during the winter of 1850.

Marx had a peculiar love for little children and the hunger

and suffering of his own must have haunted and harried his soul. He became the London correspondent of the *New York Tribune*. He received five dollars a week for his letters. This was for years his only regular and certain income. The fourth child, Henry, died in 1852. In spite of misery and privations Marx refused to receive a single penny in payment for his lectures to workingmen. He did not wish to be charged with "exploiting the movement."

Marx did not believe that labor unions could or should remain neutral upon political questions. He knew that in a constantly increasing degree the workers must depend for betterment of their conditions upon legislation. To such matters as factory legislation, accident insurance, employer's liability, old age pensions, the legal eight-hour day, child labor laws, the protection of trades union funds, security of the right of combination, freedom from crippling restraints of judicial usurpation, the trades unions can not be indifferent. He approved heartily, however, of the resolution adopted by the trades union leaders at Gotha in 1875, immediately after the union of the Socialist factions, declaring that politics should be kept out of the trades unions, but that individual members were advised to join the Social-Democratic Party, by which name the united Socialist party was known. This was not a consistent position as Bebel, in 1900, declared. He was the inspiring spirit of The International Workingmen's Association—the most ambitious and fruitful movement for arousing the proletariat to a sense of solidarity. His practical labors in connection with organizing and directing this International would alone entitle Marx to distinction. Into the short and tumultuous history of this workingmen's association we can not enter. It collapsed at the time of the Franco-Prussian War.

This paper is biographical in its nature, not a critique of Socialism, but a word concerning the basal principles of *Das Kapital* may be of interest. For ten years he had been preparing for the writing of this classic of Socialism. He read hard and continuously in the British Museum. Hundreds of treatise and Parliamentary reports were worked over. His fine sense of thoroughness and mathematical form would not permit him to offer anything less than a scientific presentation of the industrial and

social conditions as he saw them in England and to some extent in Germany and in France.

John Rae has said in his *Contemporary Socialism*, "Capital, then, as Marx understands it, may be said to be independent wealth employed for its own increase," and in "societies in which the capitalistic method of production prevails" all wealth bears distinctively this character. In more primitive days, wealth was a store of the means of life produced and preserved for the supply of the producers future wants, but now it "appears as a huge collection of wares," made for other people's wants, made for sale in the market, made for its own increase. What Marx wants to discover is how all this independent wealth has come to accumulate in hands that do not produce it, and in particular from whence comes the increase expected from its use, because it is this increase that enables it to accumulate. What he endeavors to show is that this increase of value can not take place anywhere except in the process of production, that in that process it can not come from dead materials, but only from the living creative power of labor that works upon them, and that it is accordingly virtually stolen from the laborers who made it by the superior economic force of the owners of the dead materials, without which indeed it could not be made, but whose service is entitled to a much more limited reward." Marx bases his argument on two principles which he borrowed from current economic writers, without, however, observing the limitations under which those writers taught them, and introducing besides important modifications of his own. The one principle is that value comes from labor, or that the natural value of commodities is determined by the cost of production. The second is only a special application of the first, that the natural wages of labor are determined by the cost of its production, and that the cost of the production of labor is the cost of the laborer's subsistence. The fault he finds with the present system is accordingly this, that while labor creates all value it is paid only its stated living, no matter how much value it creates; and he then goes over the phenomena of modern industrial life to show how each arrangement is invented so as to exact more and more value out of the laborer by prolonging his hours of work or enhancing its speed without giving him any

advantage whatever from the increase of value so obtained. This is not the place to attempt to disprove his theory of value, his "Iron law of wages," or the effects of machinery, and the growth of fixed capital on the working classes. We must return to our story.

Marx did not live to complete his second volume of *Das Kapital*. He became an opponent of Bakunin's program of anti-religionism in the Socialist congress in 1869. That Marx was an atheist is undeniable; but he regarded the "professional atheist," with ill-concealed contempt, and nothing could be farther from the truth than to represent him as a rabid anti-religionist. Indeed, there was the surge of a great spiritual passion within this strange man. So great was his love for the great *Divine Comedy* of Dante that he could repeat canto after canto, almost the whole of it, in fact. He came nearer to being a disciple of our Whitman in religion than to any other prophet of cosmic life. His health was now failing. By the end of 1873 he was a very sick man. The collapse of the "International" was a great blow to him, but the rising vote of the *Socialists* in 1871 had raised his hopes for the final success of the supreme purpose of his life. But his strength was rapidly declining. He made a brave fight for life. In 1880 his precious and devoted wife developed cancer from which she could not be relieved. Marx was frantic with grief. He was stricken with pleurisy and confined to bed for many weeks. On the 14th of March, 1883, the crisis came. His life-long friend Engels was summoned. He was told by the faithful companion of his wife, good Helen Demuth; and Eleanor, his daughter, that Marx would be found seated in his arm-chair half asleep. Engels went to the study and found his old friend not half asleep but fully asleep, with a smile upon his lips. Karl Marx was dead.

Three days later they laid his body to rest in the Highgate Cemetery where that of his wife had been laid fifteen months previously. Only a small handful of mourners gathered around the grave that Saturday afternoon to hear Engels; his voice broken by sobs, pay the last tender and affectionate tribute to the memory of his friend.

So passed this mighty human force whose work in book and deed still gives the greatest impetus to the Socialistic propa-

ganda of to-day. Whatever may be the fate of his theories his martyrdom in the cause of what he believed to be the truth and the way of truth's realization will place him and keep him among the great spirits of humanity.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE VIII.

RITUALISM.

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.

"Ritualism" is a comparatively new word in the English dictionary. "Ritualist" is found in Johnson's and other dictionaries of the seventeenth century, but "ritualism" as a dictionary word, is contemporary with ourselves. It owes its origin to that remarkable movement which began in Oxford in 1833.. The early adherents of the movement were called Tractarians, from the 90 Tracts which they published in defense and furtherance of their ideas; also Puseyites, after one of its most distinguished leaders. At present the name Anglicans or Anglo-Catholics is preferred by them.

The word ritualism is derived from *Rituale*, the name of that book in the Roman Catholic Church which gives detailed direction as to the manner in which acts of religious usage should be performed *rite*, that is in a proper manner.

On the subject of rites and ceremonies both the sister Churches of the Protestant Reformation took the ground that they belonged to the *adiaphora*, but while the Reformed Churches took a radical course, removing and rejecting everything that they did not find authorized or commanded in the Scripture, making a *tabula rasa*, and returning to extreme simplicity, the Lutherans took a conservative position, retaining in the Church worship everything that was not contrary to the Word of God. A superficial observer, unacquainted with the significance of the liturgy, might in Lutheran worship therefore scarcely notice any distinction from that which is observed in Roman Catholic Churches.

The English Church in the days of the Protestant Reformation was of the Lutheran type. Its leaders, Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, were in close touch with Luther and Melancthon. The Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth was a Lutheran Liturgy. The Thirty-nine Articles were modeled after the Augsburg Confession, and many of them are almost verbal reproductions of the Augustana, with such modifications as

would be satisfactory to the Reformed also. Martin Buzer came over from Strassburg and spent a long time in Oxford, aiding the English in their liturgical and doctrinal work.

Edward the Sixth's Prayer Book of 1549 has all the ear marks of having been constructed under the influence of the Lutheran Liturgy of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, 1543. I mention this for the benefit of the Episcopalian brethren who firmly believe that their book was made in the year 1, and who say to me: "Why your service is very much like ours."

In the seventeenth century an effort was made to conciliate the Presbyterians, and the present Book of Common Prayer is the result of that effort to conciliate and to compromise. This was done in the Savoy Conference which was held in 1661. After the Presbyterians had succeeded in carrying many of their points, and the Prayer Book had been trimmed and altered to meet their views, they withdrew and said they did not care much for a Prayer Book anyway. Thereupon they left the Episcopalians to get along with a book from which many Lutheran and historical elements had been eliminated.

The Book of Common Prayer, with all its vaunted excellencies, has also its defects. Its chief merits are its good English, and a certain brusque adaptation of some of its parts to the changed atmosphere of modern times. This latter quality it probably got from the Presbyterians. Its chief defect is a jumbling together into one of three distinct services, viz.: Morning Prayer, a Preparatory Service, and the regular Morning Service. This produces the conglomeration and iteration which have made the Episcopal form of worship a fair object of criticism.

The ritualistic movement has a special interest for us because it is almost contemporaneous with at least the older members of our ministry. Although from the outside, we have witnessed its conflicts and its successes. The career of its leaders is familiar to us. Its watchwords and many of its phrases are stereotyped in the literature of our times and its aims have called forth our sympathy or our resentment as the case may be. The great men of the Anglican communion whom we have known or who have just preceded us have lived their lives with a definite relation to this movement. And we have seen what is practically the triumph of the movement not only in England but also in

America. Whether for good or ill, it has been a victorious movement among the adherents of Episcopal polity. And it has deeply affected almost all other churches. The existence of a well-defined policy, consistent and uncompromising, could not but have a controlling influence upon multitudes of spineless Protestants whose religion was purely a matter of subjectivity, with no clear conception of the doctrine of the Church and with no dogmatic convictions to anchor them to the truth once delivered to the saints.

To understand the scope of the movement, we must take a glance at the times in which it originated. Religion was at a low ebb in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. The Wesleyan movement had failed to influence the Church of England, and its adherents had been cast out of the synagogue. Infidelity and worldliness were the characteristics of the times. The Evangelical revival which occurred at the beginning of the century had a deep and widespread influence. Tract and Bible societies, missionary work and the preaching of the Gospel produced results of the greatest magnitude. The regeneration of the Church of England was undoubtedly due to this Evangelical movement. But, as it was essentially a practical movement, dealing only with personal Christianity and with no interest in the Church or dogma, looking upon these things as the letter that killeth, it failed to bring about any permanent results in the Christian communion. Then came the great political changes. The abolition of the Test Act, the admission of non-conformists and Catholics to political privileges, the extinction of half the Irish bishoprics, and similar catastrophies made the adherents of the English State Church feel that it was time to set their house in order.

It was under these conditions that a number of young Oxford men came together in Hadleigh in July, 1833, to consider the needs of the times. Their names were Keble, Pusey, Newman, Froude and Perceval. They were filled with religious zeal and with an intense desire to find a remedy for the evils of the times in which they lived. As Oxford men their thoughts naturally recurred to Archbishop Laud, whose life had been so closely associated with their university, and it seemed to them that the salvation of the English Church depended upon a restoration of his system. Laud, you remember, was the ecclesiastical mentor

of the Stuarts and the persecutor of the Puritans. Born in the latter part of the sixteenth century, he early attained ecclesiastical promotion, endeavored by all means to restore the ceremonies and discipline of the Pre-Reformation period, and after a strenuous career of politico-religious strife was decapitated in 1645 at the age of 72. On the scaffold he preached a sermon from Hebrews 12:2, "Looking unto Jesus," and offered a prayer of saintly unction, an expression of penitence and faith such as any Christian might desire to make in the hour of his departure. He was the best hated and best loved man of his time. Many things that he did we must criticise, for instance the cutting off of Prynne's ears, but his death was an event of incomparable dignity.

It seems a pity that such men have to be killed. But in those hard-headed days it was difficult to convince men by ordinary argument, and the only really effective way of preventing erroneous cerebration was the amputation of that part of the body which contained the diseased organ.

I have spoken so much of Laud because the Ritualists themselves looked upon him as their leader, and advocated a return to the principles for which he contended. Briefly stated, this was Laud's position: Want of uniformity produces the greatest confusion. Worship in the spirit is the chief thing, but external unity is an important testimony to the world. The Scriptures, as the Primitive Church and an Ecumenical Council explain them, are the only rule in matters of faith. Ceremonies have a reflex influence on the soul. In place of the absolute decree he proclaimed the doctrine of grace. Sacraments meant more than the Puritans hold concerning them. Baptism confers regeneration. The Lord's Supper is not merely a sacramentum but is also a sacrificium. Here we find the outlines of the chief positions of the Ritualists as they were subsequently developed: the appeal to the Primitive Church, the importance of Catholicity, the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper and the importance of ceremonies.

And on most of these questions it is easy to see how a sensible and pious Christian man was almost compelled to take the position of Laud. The Puritans had snapped the thread of history. He attempted to restore it. The Puritans plunged into the confusion of sectarianism and individualism, he em-

phasized Catholicity, the Puritans emphasized the decree, he emphasized grace; the Puritans were iconoclasts who destroyed the stately temples and looked upon their fair decorations as the garments of the great whore, he endeavored to restore all those beautiful things which the sanctified art of the ages had laid down at the feet of Him whom they worshipped; the Puritans shoved the Lord's table all around the Church and sat upon it, he placed it in the Eastern choir, put a screen before it and tried to impress some ideas of reverence and decency upon the people. Of course he went too far. But the Puritans have their faults too, and it is no wonder that the pendulum swung again in the other direction. Much as we must condemn Laud from our standpoint, his position is easily understood and it was almost inevitable.

During the Restoration the Laud movement maintained itself for a little while, but with the departure of the Stuarts its influence subsided, until it suddenly came to life again in the Oxford movement of 1833.

The soul of this movement was Richard Hurrell Froude. He was a fellow and tutor in Oriel College, born in 1803 and died in 1836 at the age of 33. Both then and now the ideas which he expressed in essays, letters and sermons were the controlling factors in the movement.

Disappointed in his study of the English Reformation he turned at first to the Laud school. Laud had been a Fellow at Oxford and a benefactor of the university. Through Laud Froude was led back to the Primitive Church. The canon of Vincentius of Lirinum, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ad omnibus creditum est*, he recognizes as the principle of Catholicity, the criterion of the true Church. The Reformation, he complains, had taken away the *jus divinum* of the Church, had made the sermon instead of the sacrament the means of grace, had made justification by faith an integral part of the doctrine of salvation; and of the Church system, discipline, &c., only a few crumbs remained that had fallen from the Apostles' tables. "I hate the Reformers and the Reformation," he declared, "and I am convinced that the rationalistic spirit which proceeded from them is none other than the false prophet of the Apocalypse." He pours out the vials of his wrath on the phraseology of the Protestants. He will have nothing to do with those who irreverent-

ly speak of the Holy Eucharist as the Lord's Supper, of priests as ministers, of the altar as the Lord's Table. He believed that a revival of monasticism would solve the problem of the spiritual need in the great cities. He had an aesthetic temperament, and he desired that architecture, furniture and music might be governed by the best models of the ancient Church.

Three principles are maintained by the Ritualists:

1. The authority of the primitive church. 2. Desirability of union with the Episcopal churches of the continent (Romish, Greek, &c.) 3. The retention of the Pre-Reformation ceremonial of worship.

My subject does not require me to deal with their positions in the matter of doctrine or church polity. Their views on ceremonial were not emphasized during the first 25 years of their history. It was not till 1859 that this became a burning question in England. The six points of ceremony were the Eastward position, eucharistic vestments, lights, incense, the mixed chalice, unleavened bread (the wafer).

The rubrics of the Anglican ritual prescribe in the most exact and definite manner the movements of the priest. The wayfaring man need not err. With much of this there will be little sympathy among the readers of this article, and I already anticipate the ridicule which you will heap upon the ecclesiastical millinery and the religious attitudinarianism of these hopelessly impractical repristinationists.

But there is another side to the story. The ritualism of the ritualists should be set over against the ritualism of the anti-ritualists. It is perhaps only a matter of taste, but a reverent folding of the hands in prayer certainly seems more decent than the impudent crossing of the arms across the back, or addressing the Almighty with hands in the pockets.

To sign yourself with the cross, and to bow the head at the mention of the Redeemer's name may be Catholic, but it is more likely to promote a reverent use of the hour of service than the giggling and gossiping which are so common in many of our religious assemblies. The ritualistic priest is somewhat stiff in his movements; still I prefer his ways to those of the Protestant preacher who lounges back in his sofa on the pulpit platform, engaged in easy conversation with one of his colleagues, or crossing his legs, vulgarly stares at the audience, possibly even count-

ing his congregation when he ought to be saying his prayers.

Chasuble, cope and stole are garments which I do not require, but a minister arrayed in some such uniform, with a style that never changes, looks better to me than one who adopts the garb of a hotel waiter or a dry goods clerk. The jingling airs and the hippity-hop of much of our congregational singing cannot compare with the stately measures of church song. The paraments of the Lord's house will forever protest against the uncouth decorations of many a church interior, and the dignity and reverent lines of church architecture against the florid and profane structures which sometimes bear the name of churches.

Smile as we may at some of the idiosyncracies of our ritualistic brethren, they have got hold of ideas that it may be well for us to consider. When the German barbarians had conquered Rome, they stopped with amazement at the sight of Christian priests ministering in the churches, and were themselves conquered in turn. People instinctively feel that there ought to be some correspondence between the outward form and the ideas which it represents. No wonder that some of our fashionable congregations of non-conformist origin, with a dim and groping feeling of their defects, introduce into their worship all sorts of ritual borrowed from the Episcopalians, but not understanding their history or significance, sometimes produce the effect of an unclassified collection of liturgical antiquities.

I hold no brief for the defense of the Ritualists, but I think it well to remind ourselves that there always was some justification for their position, in Cyprian's day, in Laud's day, in Pusey's day and in our day, and that instead of simply scorning them, we should ascertain the secret of the strength of such a movement, which must inevitably prevail if it is confronted only by the unhistorical anarchy of non-conforming individualism.

Neither ritualism nor its antagonists will have the last word to say on the subject of the forms of worship, but evangelical freedom under the guidance of historical principles. Neither spiritualistic fear of forms nor spiritless subjection to forms has its place in the worship of the evangelical church. We are the immediate heirs of the Rationalistic period which in iconoclastic folly destroyed many beautiful forms, and then like the child with the broken vase wondered that the contents had gone. In our study of the liturgy and admiration of its beauty, the

danger is that we do not understand the spirit and thus fall into mere formalism.

There is such a thing as church style which is born of the Scriptures, not merely for the church building but also for the congregational service. Its foundation principle is "edification" (1 Cor. 14, 12). Its rule is "Let all things be done decently and in order." (Verse 40).

This church style, without being a ritual law, as in Rome, becomes the law of action whenever it is desired to give suitable expression to the Word of God in acts of worship and particularly in the expression of the Visible Word, the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

In the Church of the Augsburg Confession there are two fundamental principles, the authority of the Word of God and justification by faith. Hence preaching, the preaching of the Word of God, occupies a central position in the Lutheran service. In the Ritualistic movement we may also find two ultimate principles, the authority of the Church, and salvation by sacraments. Hence preaching with them occupies only a subordinate place. On these two positions of the Ritualists (the authority of the Church and Salvation by works) we Lutherans take issue with them absolutely.

First as to the Church. There are two definitions of the Church. The first of these dominated Christendom for 1300 years from the Cyprian to Bellarmine. It is that the Church is an institution with which men become connected, not by any *interna virtus* but solely through an external profession of faith and an external use of the sacraments. This is the Romish view and this is the view of Ritualism. The Church is edified, built up, kept alive, by the virtue that oozes from the hands of the clergyman. The other definition of the Church is that it is a communion, a congregation of saints, that is of those who are being sanctified, healed. This is the universal Protestant position.

Second as to the sacraments. We also, unlike the Reformed denominations, believe that the sacraments are means of grace in the strict and technical sense. But they derive their validity, not *opere operato*, or from any priestly function, but from the Word of God. And particularly do we take exception to their view of the Communion. It is a sacrament and not a sacrifice. It is a sacrament, that is a gift of God to us, and not a sacrifice,

that is, an offering which we make to God, as teach the Zwinglians, most ancient Protestant denominations, and the Ritualists, strange colleagues indeed in this case.

It is this sacrificial view of the Lord's Supper that lies at the base of all their ritualistic errors. From an aesthetic point of view, I agree with this mode of conducting worship. But from a closer examination of their books and ceremonies it may easily be seen that their service is more than mere symbolism, it is the worship of a God that has been made by the hand of a priest.

The early Church knew nothing of the sacrificial character of the Supper. But the rhetorical character of the Greek language lent itself to liturgical expressions which step by step led to a conception of the sacrament that was foreign to its original meaning. Through Cyprian and Gregory this conception became a fundamental position of the Roman system and through Laud and Froude and Pusey it has again obtained a foothold in the Protestant Church after Luther and the Reformation had repudiated it as an utter perversion of its original purpose and significance.

Doubtless in this fragmentary presentation of the subject I have not been able to conceal a degree of sympathy with the Ritualistic movement and admiration for that which it has accomplished. There are many things in it which are wonderfully attractive, and which, whatever we may say or think, will continue to exert a permanent influence on the lives of men. I love their historical sense, their reverence for tradition, their aesthetic tact, their decency in the method of conducting worship, and above all their religious zeal. The Holy Supper is more than a memorial feast, they recognize in it the presence of the Lord. All of these things bring them into close alliance with the Lutheran system. At our first meeting, when I come in contact with a High Church Anglican we seem like long lost brothers. But it does not take long to discover that there is no relation. But it does not take long to discover that there is no relationship. Froude says he hates the Reformation. Ritualism, in its essential and central position, I hate it with a perfect hatred. For all that we seem to have in common, their fundamental positions separate them *toto coelo* from the Church of the Conservative Reformation.

New York City.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Methodist Review (Sept.-Oct.) contains an article on "Luther's Lectures on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans," by Professor G. C. Cell, D.D., of the Boston University, reciting the facts of the recent discovery of the original manuscript in the Royal Library of Berlin, where, strange to say, it has reposed undisturbed in a show case. "The original document makes 152 pages of printed text, written notes and comment. This material fills 588 pages 8 vo. Luther wrote a very fine hand, neat and accurate, nowhere slovenly. The subject matter of the Lectures is divided into two main parts, the Glossae and the Scholia. The former consists of suggestive words, pointed phrases, concise sentences written between the lines and along the margin, serving as memoranda for the lectures. The state of the writing indicates that the interlinear notes were written first and the marginal reflections added afterward. The subject matter of the Scholia comes out of a much more thorough mental process. Here we have a final weaving together into a living connected whole of a large mass of fragmentary productions." To Professor Johann Ficker belongs the credit for bringing to light again this most valuable commentary of Luther. Dr. Cell shows a proper appreciation not only of this notable work but also of its renowned author.

"Whitefield's Divine Gift" is discussed in the same number of the *Methodist Review* by Professor Tipple of Drew Seminary. The secret of his marvelous power over an audience surely did not lie in the mere letter of his sermons as we have them in print—eighty of them. Benjamin Franklin felt that Whitefield had done himself great injustice by permitting their publication. "For the most part they are flat, stale and unprofitable. The common criticism of them is that they contain no powerful movement of thought and the criticism is a just one." Of course, Whitefield preached without manuscript and his best passages were often the inspiration of the moment. At all

events he made the most profound impression upon all classes of people, and must have been possessed of real and great power. Some critics have found the secret of his influence over his hearers in his deep piety. He was a consecrated man and prayed without ceasing, but this was only an element in his power, for many other preachers have been equally devoted without becoming noted. The author asks, "Would it not be more nearly correct to say that he had a gift from God, namely, the divine spirit called eloquence and that the effectiveness of this gift was heightened by his piety? It was Whitefield's divine gift—and why not agree that the mystery of eloquence comes as near as anything we know to a preternatural endowment; that what men call unction is indefinable and inexplicable; that genius is not of the market place, or of the mountain, but of God? It was this God-bestowed gift which secured for Whitefield favor with all classes of people." "Whitefield regarded his oratory as a gift of his Creator, and this is the opinion of his biographers." He had a wonderful voice, strong, musical, "carrying" and underperfect control. He strongly urged the importance of the study and practice of elocution in preparation for the ministry. He possessed an unusual gift of emotion. There was deep pathos in his voice. His "weeping silences" few could withstand. He was overwhelmed with a passion for souls. "He preached more successfully than any man of his generation, and the secret of his unrivaled power was in the faithful cultivation and use of his matchless endowment and other divine gifts, the sum total of which we designate by the elusive term, personality."

The great convention of the Baptists in Philadelphia during the past summer is the inspiration of the "Baptist World Alliance Number of *The Review and Expositor*." "The Attitude of Baptists to Catholicism," "Baptists in the Modern World," "The Attitude of Baptists to the non-Christian World," "History of Baptist Organization," "The Struggle for Religious Liberty," "Some Types and Tendencies Among American Baptists," "The Origin and Principles of the Anabaptists," and "The Moral Significance of Baptism," are the themes discussed.

The last article makes "Baptism * * the symbol of the actual death and resurrection of Christ, and at the same time the symbol of the (as it were) actual death and resurrection of the be-

liever. That is to say: his relation to the world, on the one hand, as expressed in his baptism, is the relation of one dead; and on the other hand, his relation to Christ is the relation of one risen from the dead." A true Baptist denies that baptism is a sacrament. It has no "efficacy as a means for the transmission of grace." It is merely "a beautiful and expressive symbol of certain basal facts in the redemptive mission of the Lord Jesus Christ, together with certain correlated and dependent ideas. * * The sole value of the rite consists in this." Other writers in the *Review* agree with this exceedingly low view of baptism. It seems passing strange that with this view our Baptist brethren should insist so strenuously upon the rite, and that too upon a particularistic method of its administration. If it be a mere symbol, its omission can not be very serious. In actual practice, however, the Baptists put quite a different emphasis upon its necessity. Indeed, as far as we can see, baptism by immersion is the one bond that binds these brethren together—not very compactly, it is true. Dr. Landrum's discussion of "Some Types," &c., is very interesting. He finds the following types: the Liberalistic, the Literalistic, the Ritualistic, the Pessimistic, and the Pietistic. The modification of these types and the unification of the denomination is gradually going on and will probably find their most potent factor in the reflex influence of Foreign Missions.

"Rational Mysticism and New Testament Christianity" is the attractive theme discussed by Henry W. Clark of Harpenden, England, in the July *Harvard Theological Review*. Mysticism rightly declares that religion is ultimately and essentially a losing of self in God. Cold reason has sometimes betrayed mysticism into accepting a false antithesis, that because it may go beyond reason that therefore it is hostile to it. As a fact there is no conflict between the two. It is true that mysticism is not, except incidentally, a matter of knowledge. It is something else and something more. It means "the acceptance of God by man as the actual, energizing, dynamic source of all that man is—man setting himself in such a Godward relation that henceforth he is, in regard to all that proceeds from him in the way of activity, emotion, and the rest, mediate instead of immediate, a channel instead of a spring. Mysticism aims at the substitu-

tion of God's initiative for man's within man's own personality—except, of course, that the initiative of surrender, the initiative in giving up initiative, must on man's part be ceaselessly maintained." With this revised apprehension of what mysticism in its essence really is, we may be led to see that there is nothing incompatible between it and reason.

"The Pastor and Teacher in New England," discussed by Vergil V. Phelps of Montana in the same *Review* is of great historic interest and suggestive. He shows that "in early New England a fully organized church had as officers a pastor, a teacher, and at least one ruling elder, and one deacon." The pastor was the administrative head, visitor and adviser, while the teacher was the educational and doctrinal leader, but he was not a schoolmaster. In the public service it was he who read and expounded the Bible, while the pastor would follow with practical applications and exhortations. They were practically equal in position, pay and honor. This "institution of pastor and teacher was the general practice of the New England Churches about 1640." It gradually declined and with the American Revolution it disappeared altogether. The origin of the institution the author finds in Theodore Beza, who drew his ideas from Erasmus, and the church fathers, Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen. However, the idea that the Church as a local congregation, independent of all outside authority, demanded both pastor and teacher. This was the theory and practice of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin.

New England lost the teacher, but he became identified with the great public school movement. Yet the author deplors the consequent separation of education and religion.

Concerning this institution we would say that the Puritan idea was anomalous and died naturally. The author does not even allude to the parochial school. The parochial school teacher fills all the necessary requirements and we can only deplore that outside of the Catholic Church and some branches of our own Lutheran Church he does not exist.

A considerable part of the July *Princeton Theological Review* is taken up with articles on the English Bible, the tercentenary of the publication of whose Authorized Version occurred this year. "Of this 'Authorized Version' two things

must be said," remarks Dr. Erdman, "first, it was not a version, and second, it was never authorized. Instead of being a new version it was in reality a revision of the work of Tyndale; not more than four words in a hundred were altered. The phrase on the title page 'translated from the original languages' is not to be taken too literally. * * The work of Tyndale shaped all that was done.

The genesis of the English Bible is most interesting. A century before the birth of Luther, John Wicliff had given the English the Bible in their own tongue; but violent persecutions practically destroyed this precious work, so that 150 years later when Luther's translation appeared the English were without the Bible.

It is to William Tyndale (b. 1484) that the English owe the Bible out of which the Authorized Version grew. It seems strange that in the recent literature called forth by the tercentenary celebration no mention should be made of Tyndale's dependence upon Luther's work. Dr. Jacobs, in his "Lutheran Movement in England" (Chap. ii), has clearly demonstrated that Tyndale made free use of Luther's translation.

In *The Reformed Church Review* for July, Rev. E. B. Niver, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, Baltimore, writes of "The Episcopal Church and Unity," in which he sketches three epoch-making movements in his church toward unity, showing first the ideal of unity which the Episcopal Church has come to possess; and secondly, the part which he thinks that communion has in furthering it. The earliest of these movements goes back over fifty years and is associated with the name of Dr. Muhlenberg. The second is the utterance of the Chicago Convention of 1886, which led to the Lambeth Platform or Quadrilateral. The last is the action of the Cincinnati Convention of 1910, calling a Conference on Faith and Order planned on the lines of the recent great Edinburgh Missionary Conference. The first movement, headed by Muhlenberg, who presented a Memorial to the General Convention in New York in 1853, reached no practical end, and was forgotten amid the great issues of the Civil War.

The second movement crystalized into a statement of four supposed self-evident propositions necessary to the unity of the Church of Christ. The acceptance (a) of the Bible as the Re-

vealed Word, (b) of the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, (c) of the two Sacraments, (d) of "The Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God unto the unity of his Church." This platform was adopted two years later at the Lambeth Conference by the Bishops of practically the whole Episcopal Church throughout the world.

The present movement lays down no principles but pleads for a fraternal conference of all Christian denominations, many of whom have, indeed, already accepted the invitation to send representatives to consider the momentous question of Christian unity. While the call makes no mention of "the historic episcopate" its interpreter, in the article before us, alludes to it as the distinctive contribution which the Anglican Church must offer toward the unifying of Protestant Christianity. He says, "The most distinctive mark of the Anglican Church among the Churches of the Reformation is the Episcopate. In the Providence of God that Church is the steward, the trustee, of an historic ministry.* * It is a ministry reaching back in the past to the earliest Christian ages."

We can not doubt the sincerity of our Episcopal brethren, and heartily endorse the effort toward unity, but the insistence upon "the historic episcopate" as a fundamental principle will not bring the non-Episcopal Churches into a common fold.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL R. WENTZ, A.M. B.D.

The facts of Luther's life, his religious and theological development, continue to busy the historians on both sides of the Atlantic. American literature of the present year has been unusually well represented on this field by McGiffert's vivid and picturesque portrayal in the current issues of *The Century*, and by the stimulating volume of Preserved Smith just published. But a new biography of Luther has also recently appeared in Luther's own native tongue. It comes from the pen of a Catholic theologian. The first volume embracing nearly seven hundred large pages of fine print has already passed into the second edition. The work is planned for three volumes and when complete will be more comprehensive than any Protestant work on

Luther. The author of this pretentious book is the Jesuit theologian in Innsbruck, Hartmann Grisar. Now the learning of the Jesuists has long since commanded the respect even of the Protestants. But history has taught us to recognize in that order the most determined foe of Protestantism. And as such the Jesuists regard themselves. The published literature of the Jesuists and even the official documents of the Catholic Church openly proclaim the principle that Loyola was the special agent divinely raised up to withstand the ravages of Protestantism. What sort of Luther biography may we expect from a member of a society that is committed to implacable hatred of the heretics and that regards itself as the divinely ordained remedy for the wicked and adulterous generation of Martin Luther? And yet it will not suffice to consign Grisar to the limbus of dogmatic and prepossessed historians and therewith dismiss him from our presence. This work of his is very tactfully disposed. It is stripped of that artless naivete of hatred and that manifest prejudice which has characterized the previous works on Luther which have come from the Roman camp. Its promises are alluring. It is therefore the more dangerous. Moreover, Hartmann Grisar has for some years been recognized as a Catholic scholar without a Protestant superior in his comprehensive knowledge of Luther's writings and of all the literature on Luther both Catholic and Protestant. His biography of Luther therefore can not be ignored.

Grisar's work is not without a pretense of historical objectivity. The cool conservative style in which he writes and the serious scientific forms which he employs awaken at once a feeling of confidence in the reader. In the introduction he calmly discusses the question whether it is actually impossible for a Catholic historian to lay aside all subjective prepossessions and to depict Luther as he really is without offending the just feelings of the Protestants. This question he answers with a decided affirmative and then feigning the spirit of reconciliation he proceeds tactfully to his task. Herein he differs, and that purposely, from his predecessors among the Catholic biographers of Luther. They made no secret of their real feelings for the subject of their portrayals. The three most important Catholic biographers of Luther have been Janssen, Evers, and Denifle. The portrayal of Janssen thirty years ago which

served the Catholics so conveniently during the Luther-Jubilee of 1883, has long since been recognized even by the Catholics themselves as utterly false in its perspective and even consciously perverse in its intent. Janssen's ingenious art of making excerpts from the sources and of disposing his material in such a way as to suggest false conclusions without actually drawing them, has been laid bare and has thoroughly discredited him. Even more unsatisfactory was the effort completed ten years later of George Evers, the convert from the Lutheran ministry. Evers' six volumes of popular-magazine pamphletary constitute a sustained outburst of hate. The ugly tone, the indecency of the main content, the hateful nicknames employed, have brought it about that no one quotes from Evers to-day if he wishes to be taken seriously. Then, little more than a decade later (1904), came the effort of the Dominican, Heinrich Denifle. This work by such an eminent scholar thoroughly acquainted with the Middle Ages, has given decided stimulus to recent research concerning Luther. [Vide LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. xxxix, p. 251 sqq.] Denifle did not live to complete his work but the second volume was finished by the inferior hand of his fellow-Dominican, Albert Maria Weiss. The theme of this work is Luther the renegade who has fallen away from his order because of his own moral depravity. Denifle's biography has given Protestant historians no little concern, and they have not yet made an end of all the problems calling for solution. But the labored inartistic disposition of the work, its open passion, its coarse style, and above all its intemperate polemics, have branded it as highly unsatisfactory, as a scientific work.

None of these three works fully answers the demand for a respectable dignified biography of Luther from the Catholic representatives of historical science.

That Denifle does not satisfy the Catholic camp is manifest in the quick appearance of this new work of Grisar and its success on the market. And as a matter of fact Grisar shows a very different temper and employs a very different style from that of his predecessors. He claims to stand with both feet upon the platform of unhampered scientific investigation. He says he recognizes it as a necessary principle in historical research that the religious convictions of the author dare never lead him to misinterpret the sources or to distort the inflexible facts of the

past. He declares that it is his earnest desire to promote "respect and love between the confessions." This all promises well.

One of the first features of the new biography to fix the attention of the reader is the clearing away of the many fables and myths which the Papists have attached to Luther's life. It is refreshing to read these concessions. Has Catholic science really come to the confessional? A few items will serve as examples. The beautiful incident in Luther's boyhood in Eisenach, when he found a kindly home in the house of Frau Cotta, is no longer distorted into an ugly scandal. Frau Cotta is recognized by Grisar as an estimable old lady of benign disposition and her house as highly respected and well-to-do. Grisar also clears away another foolish fiction which has long persisted in Catholic literature and which maliciously interjects a scandal into Luther's life as a young monk in Erfurt. The false documentary evidence with which this fiction was buttressed is exposed to daylight, and "the respect which Luther enjoyed" is held to prove it impossible.

With equal candor and merit does Grisar oppose the Catholic custom of representing Luther's attack upon indulgences as the outgrowth of Augustinian hatred and envy against the Dominicans. Grisar claims that Luther's jealousy of the Dominicans afterwards poured oil on the fire, but admits that it was by no means the first cause of the conflagration. Superficial and biased is the habit so common among all Catholics since 1517, of claiming that if Luther or an Augustinian had received the Papal commission which Tetzel the Dominican received, there would have been no Reformer. The bias of this view is finally admitted. Grisar devotes one whole section to what he calls "the Wartburg Legends" and takes occasion among other things, to remove another scandal which Catholics have imposed upon Luther's stay in the castle there. Moreover, with reference to Luther's marriage, an event which has always played such a large part in Romish interpretations of Luther's life and work, Grisar's position marks an advance. He asserts, of course, that according to canonical law (and therefore imperial law) no marriage can be valid between a monk and a nun who have broken their monastic vows, but he frankly admits that all the formalities of a legal marriage were properly observed in Luther's case

and stoutly defends the honor of Luther and Catherine against the libel and vaunting calumny of the gossips.

These few instances will serve to indicate how Grisar breaks with the past of Catholic representations concerning Luther and how he refuses credence to the favorite fictions of the Papists. But just this feature we must regard as one of the dangerous elements in this new portrait. The false perspective is more difficult to detect. For by this sort of criticism and concession Grisar awakens in his uncritical reader a high degree of confidence in his scientific accuracy and large respect for his historical objectivity. The reader who is not acquainted with the sources feels inclined therefore to entrust himself to Grisar's fairmindedness and to accept perforce all that is said to Luther's faircredit, and this is by far the larger part of the work.

Here again a few examples. The cooling of Luther's monastic ardor and the decline of his religious zeal takes its beginning from his trip to Rome in 1510. Luther was very unscrupulous, says Grisar, in selecting his company in Rome and for that reason took offense at the Holy City. He passed by the Stairs of Pilate for reasons of convenience. He neglected most of his religious duties in Rome and thus began the ebb of his piety. But the real beginning of Luther's alienation from the Church and the Pope came when the Pope refused to grant Luther's request that he be allowed to lay aside monastic garb and to remain in Italy for ten years to study. This refusal so offended Luther's sense of honor that he never fully recovered his friendly feelings for Rome and when later the controversy on indulgences became a practical matter Luther found it quite easy to rise in protest against the Pope and his offensive authority. This is indeed quite a novel theory concerning the real beginning of Luther's alienation from Rome and reminds us strongly of Duke George's charge that Luther revolted because the Pope would not make him bishop or cardinal.

Scholars have busied themselves a great deal during the last decade with the problem of Luther's development to his complete break with Rome. (Incidentally be it remarked, this entire question of Luther's inner development has received new light by the discovery two years ago of Luther's lectures on Romans and has recently been made the subject of an able comprehensive discussion by Professor Otto Scheel of Tübingen in his

plastic little work, *Die Entwicklung Luthers bis zum Abschluss der Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* in the twenty-seventh volume of the *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*). It is a well known fact that Catholic scholars have sought the key to an understanding of Luther's gradual fall from grace in his own physical immorality. By a sensuous interpretation of Luther's *concupiscentia*, by distorting his doctrine *de servo arbitrio*, and by misinterpreting his own personal confessions and expressions of humility, the conclusion to his ethical depravity was made quite plausible. Grisar does us the favor of dropping this method of procedure and admitting that Luther's primary motive among others was religious. But our joy is not complete, for Grisar takes very frequent opportunity to arouse in his reader's mind the strongest suspicions concerning Luther's ethical integrity. This he does sometimes by direct statement, more often by implications and suggested inferences which leave little remaining of his professed historical objectivity and his "spirit of reconciliation." These accusations can not even be indicated here. Many of them are recounted and energetically and conclusively refuted in Kawerau's *Luther in katholischer Beleuchtung*, 1911. There is little comfort in the apologies which Grisar offers for Luther's transgressions.

We have seen how Grisar explains the beginning of Luther's changed attitude through his experience in Rome. This decline of his religious zeal prepared for his complete break in 1519. The once loyal and devoted Augustinian gradually cools in his piety and in his love for the Church. The whirl of work and distractions, the intemperate participation in social functions and convivialities, leave no time for the exercise of the practical Christian virtues. Utterly devoid of intellectual and moral discipline, filled with the spirit of opposition, a stranger to meditation, repentance, and humility, and with a knowledge of the needs of practical religion, the piqued monk slowly gravitates away from the Church towards the court of Frederick the Wise until in 1519 he severs the last cord that binds him to salvation. His greatest fault is, of course, his intellectual pride. This is the one ready explanation that the Catholic Church monotonously employs to account for heresy. And this she does consistently. It is only natural that variations from the prescribed teachings of an infallible Church should be ascribed to

intellectual pride. Critics of dogmatic traditions never escape that verdict without receiving a worse one. It is one of the tragedies of individuality that the person who sees problems which others can not see, who has experiences which others do not have, and who confidently defends as true what his entire generation regards as false, must be led to the cross and ridiculed for his vaunting pride. And when Martin Luther goes down into the ditch and begins with his own hands to dig up the infallible Church of the Middle Ages the kindest explanation possible for those within the edifice is to ascribe his unpleasant operations to his "pride of spirit." This kindest explanation Grisar graciously employs. It is perhaps the mildest verdict that Luther has yet received from a correct Papist, and we do well to recognize Grisar's honesty of purpose and the improvement he has made upon his antecedents in this matter. Whether his assertions that Martin Luther was a stranger to practical piety and to humility can be maintained in the light of the facts, is not for us here to investigate.

In general it will be admitted that Grisar's biography marks an advance upon those of Janssen, Evers, and Denifle. But the fact that Grisar in spite of his great learning, his wide knowledge of the literature on his subject, and his manifest honesty of effort, should have failed in all essential points to bring an adequate reproduction of Luther's life, leads us to ask whether we may ever hope for a satisfactory Luther biography from a Catholic pen. We have highly meritorious Catholic works on Calvin, as witness those of Kampschulte and Cornelius. But let us recall that Kampschulte and Cornelius were not theologians but profane historians in the full enjoyment of academic freedom. Moreover, in Calvin's work the matter of chief concern is to explain the complex interaction of the political situation and the ecclesiastical relations, while in the biography of Luther the chief task is to portray his religious personality and his inner development. It is true, very orthodox Catholics often manifest a kindly attitude toward Protestants. But let us recall that the kindly attitude towards present-day Protestants is officially based upon our "*ignorantia invincibilis*" and is by no means extended to one who has been in the real Church and has fallen away. Now Luther is in Catholic eyes not only an apostate from grace but the very chief of heretics who led thousands

to perdition and himself died under the ban of the Holy Church. Is it possible that with such prepossessions adequately, *i. e.*, scientifically, to portray Luther's religious development as Reformer? No, the dogma directs the pen and therefore hinders the free course of scientific presentation. The verdict has fallen before the investigation has begun. The religious division in the sixteenth century was due either to a fault in the Church or to a fault in Martin Luther. But for the Papist the Church can have no fault. Therefore the Catholic biographer must portray Luther's fault. He dare not agree with him; he can not understand him. And we may never hope for an adequate biography of Luther from Catholic pen.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Missionary Heroes of the Lutheran Church. By L. B. Wolf, D.D. 60 cents paper, 75 cents cloth, net.

The heroes here presented are, almost without exception, so familiar to our pastors and people that we may name them without initials or titles, Ziegenbalg, Schwartz, Heyer, Officer, Harpster, Rowe, Day and Kinsinger. Two of the sketches are by the Editor, Rev. L. B. Wolf, D.D., himself a missionary for twenty-four years, one of the succession to the pioneer Heyer, a co-worker with Harpster, while the others are by such well known writers as John Aberly, D.D., Charles E. Hay, D.D., W. W. Criley, D.D., Jacob A. Clutz, D.D., George Scholl, D.D., and the Rev. E. G. Howard. Six of these subjects gained right to a place in this volume by their labors in India, while the other two Officer and Day, won the same distinction by their connection with the Muhlenberg Mission. It would not be well to make comparison between these men. They differed in natural endowments; some of them were pioneers, others were followers; some of them gave the service of a long life, while others fell in their places, and it is sad to write it even now, when they had only begun to get their tasks in hand. In these, and other particulars they differed, while in worthy Christian character, in high ideal, in unfaltering, unselfish devotion, they stand upon the same high plane, entitled to equal honor and loving commemoration.

We have named these presentation, *sketches*, and that is what they are. The limited space did not permit complete biographies. Yet the material has been so carefully selected and so compactly presented, that we get a recognizable portrait of each individual, and a fair understanding of his place and part in his chosen work. Of course, each author evinces appreciation of his subject, yet each one has written with moderation. There is no painting in strong, exaggerated colors.

In two brief introductory essays the Editor traces the beginnings of distinctively foreign missionary work in the Lutheran Church, first, in the fatherland from 1555 to 1800, and secondly, in our own General Synod beginning with 1820. These two essays, together with statistics of India Lutheran missions, and Dr. Lenker's tables of Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Societies in the world, give much additional information.

The volume is heartily commended, particularly to all Lutherans. It is filled with information which many of them greatly need. We could wish that every pastor might secure a copy, kindle to a brighter flame the missionary fire in his own heart, and then urgently commend it to his people. World evangelization challenges Christianity now as in no preceding period since St. Paul felt and responded to its mighty pull, and if we are to do our part in this stupendous enterprise then we must buy and earnestly study such books as this.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

Theory and Practice of Foreign Missions. By James M. Buckley. Price 75 cents net.

Growth of the Missionary Concept. By John F. Goucher. Price 75 cents.

These two volumes, from the same publishers, having to do with the same subject, and spoken before the same institution, may fittingly be joined in this brief notice.

What impels the Christian Church to this gigantic work, the evangelization of the world? This question is important, and it is wholly relevant. The answers given are various, though usually resolvable. Dr. Buckley rests this cause upon three pillars, philanthropy, recompense, and the commands and prayers of Christ. Of these three chief arguments the third is regarded as primary, and hence receives fullest treatment. The belief that such of the heathen as are true to the light which they have will be ultimately reckoned among the saved, is presented as a subsidiary argument. Next is given some account of the actual conduct of this work, including such matters as methods of organization, conditions of success, financial and administrative problems, selection and qualification of missionaries, whether they should be married or not, how to deal with non-Christian peoples, the work of women's societies, and so forth. A comparison between the circumstances favorable and unfavorable to present mission work, leads to the conclusion that while difficulties will be encountered in the prosecution of this task, and reverses and delays, the outcome is not uncertain. The victory of the Cross of Jesus Christ is sure. The fourth and concluding lecture deals with the present and the future of foreign missions, and sounds the same confident note of enthusiasm and hope.

In the second volume the subject is the same, but the approach, and consequently the treatment, are different. Dr.

Goucher works more from within. He proceeds after the fashion of the preacher, and we get his text in the first sentence, "Christ alone can save this world, but Christ can't save this world, alone." Two propositions are deduced thus: (1) the problem is God's—not forced upon him but undertaken by him according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, and (2) in the solution of this problem of human salvation God has limited himself to human co-operation. This is the philosophy of missions. Apprehension of these primary truths will shape our view of this problem, determine our practical attitude toward it, and give the measure of our co-operation therein. If, for example, we study this problem only superficially, fix attention only upon the difficulties in the way, why then the solution of the problem will seem to us *impossible*; a little stronger faith, and a little deeper study of the problem, may modify this conclusion, and the solution may seem only *improbable*; if it be remembered that Christ has determined to work through human agents, then it is seen that our co-operation is *imperative*; and if Christ has assumed the world's salvation as his special mission then his relation to the task is *indispensable*, and it is the guarantee that the solution of the problem is *inevitable*... The words in italics indicate the point of view from which the subject is presented in the successive lectures. In the unfolding large use is made of Scripture, and some of the interpretations are striking. Illustrations gathered from different mission fields, but chiefly from China, are employed with good effect.

Dr. Buckley and Dr. Goucher are both men of great ability, and wide and varied scholarship. They are acknowledged leaders in the great denomination to which they belong. Their ample qualification for the task to which they were invited by the Syracuse University will not be questioned by any. We are glad that in the midst of many labors they have had time and strength for these earnest and forceful discussions, the result in each case of many years of thought and experience, upon this great and urgent theme, the evangelization of the world.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS C. NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Bible and Modern Life. By Clayton Sedgwick Cooper. 12mo. Cloth. 16 full page half-tone illustrations. 234 pp. Price \$1.00 net.

Mr. Cooper, the author of this book, is International Secretary for Bible Study under the auspices of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations. He is

widely known as a Bible student, and as a speaker on Bible study and a leader of thoughtful men. His special work has been the organization of Bible Departments, Conventions, Institutes, and Systems for the training of Bible students. He was himself the teacher for four years, of an organized Church Bible Class numbering 500 men. In all this work he has had great success. He is prepared, therefore, to speak with authority on the subjects discussed in this volume. These subjects are, Why Men Study the Bible; The College Man, the Church and the Bible; Bible Study among Men in the Orient; Successful Organization and Conduct of Bible Study; Bible Study in Small Classes; Large Organized Bible Classes; Bible Study Courses and Literature; and The Bible as a Means to Service. There is also a lengthy Appendix containing programs for Bible Institutes and Conferences and Organized Bible Classes, and also a model Constitution and By-Laws for large organized classes of men. There is also an extended bibliography of reference literature.

In view of the great interest now taken in organized Bible Classes, and especially in men's classes, this book is especially timely. We cordially commend it to all who are interested in this line of work.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

AMERICAN LUTHERAN PUBLICATION BOARD. PITTSBURGH.

The Way of Life, or Why Should You be a Christian and a Church Member? By G. Luecke. Pp. 96. 6 1-2 x 4 in. Price 30 cents. \$3.00 and express per doz. \$23.00 and express per hundred.

This little hand-book contains a very clear and convincing presentation of the fundamental truths of the Bible and of the Christian religion. It is especially adapted to be put in the hands of young people, or older men and women, who may be tempted by doubts, or who may be hesitating about committing themselves to the Christian life or making a public profession of their faith by uniting with the Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche für Lutherische Leser Nordamerikas ausgewählt und bearbeitet von E. A. Wilhelm Krausz, Professor am Concordia-Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo. Cloth. Red edges. Size 7 1-2 x 10. Pp. viii, 800.

This handsome volume ought to find a welcome in many German homes. It is written in a flowing style and illustrated with numerous excellent cuts and reproductions in *fac simile* of historical documents of great value. The contents of the volume embrace brief descriptions of the epochs of the history of the Church from the age of the apostles to the present day.

The appendix concerning "the Lutheran Church of North America" contains three chapters treating respectively of Muhlenberg, Walther and Wyneken. Apart from the biographical sketches of these men the treatment of the Lutheran Church in America is utterly inadequate.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION BOARD. PHILADELPHIA.

The Book of Concord or The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, edited by Dr. Henry Eyster Jacobs, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. Flexible cloth. Pp. 758. Price postpaid \$1.50.

The Book of Concord is a treasure house of Christian doctrine as confessed by the Lutheran Church. No Lutheran minister is worthy of the name without owning and using this book. Only two American translations of it have been made, the older one by the Henkels of New Market, Va., and the latter by Dr. Jacobs in 1882. The present edition, called "the people's edition," is a reproduction of one of the two larger volumes of Dr. Jacobs' work, and is identical in contents and type with it, except in substituting a more recent translation of the Augsburg Confession for the former one, and in making various minor changes. There are analyses of the several books, and a complete index of subjects. The reduced price and the convenient and attractive make-up ought to be a sufficient inducement to ministers, theological students and intelligent laymen to purchase this invaluable volume.

To attempt to define its contents in this notice would be to endeavor to write on a single page the history of the Lutheran Church and the development of her doctrines. A perusal of this book will strengthen faith and stimulate devotion to the truth. We congratulate the author that he has been providentially permitted to give the Church this new edition; and also the Board which has done the mechanical work so well.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Inner Mission. A Handbook for Christian Workers. By the Rev. J. F. Ohl, Mns.D., Superintendent of the Philadelphia City Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Pp. 253. Price \$1.00.

The term "Inner Missions," has long been a familiar one in Germany. It is only within the past decade or so that it has come into general use in this country even among Lutherans. Especially is this true of English speaking Lutherans. Even now it is probable that comparatively few of our English speaking Lutherans understand the real meaning of "Inner Missions," or the extent of the work that is being done among us. The reason for this is that much of the work is carried on in the German and Scandinavian tongues, and that the work is divided between some twenty or more different Lutheran synods, or general bodies, most of which have little or no fraternal relations with each other.

The whole Church owes a debt of gratitude, therefore, to Dr. Ohl for this excellent volume, which for the first time presents, at least in English, the character, the history and the vast extent of Lutheran Inner Mission Work, both in this country and abroad.

In a brief introduction the meaning of the term and the character of the work are clearly defined. Then follows a "Preliminary History of the Inner Mission" in the early Church, in the Mediaeval Church, and in the Reformation Era and Beyond. Next the Inner Mission in its Modern Form is discussed in a chapter covering about fifty pages.

Part II deals with the various "Forms of Inner Mission Activity." The chapter headings in this part of the discussion will give an illuminating view of the character and extent of the work included under Inner Missions. They are I, The Propagation of the Gospel; II, The Care and Training of Children; III, The Training and Preservation of Young People; IV, The Protection of the Imperiled; V, The Saving of the Lost; VI, The Care of the Sick and Defective; VII, The Conflict with Social Ills.

It will be seen from this list that there is hardly any form of Christian or benevolent work known to the Church which is not included. It will be seen also how much wider and richer the term Inner Missions is than that of Home Missions with which it is often confounded among our English speaking people.

Dr. Ohl's presentation of the subject is most interesting, instructive and inspiring. His book cannot but stimulate a much wider and deeper interest in this work among our Lutheran churches, and a much more intelligent and liberal support of it.

The book is enriched by numerous illustrations and has at the close two appendixes giving many valuable statistics and a list

of all the Lutheran Inner Missions Institutions in the United States. There is also a very suggestive and helpful bibliography and an excellent index.

We most cordially commend the reading and study of this volume to our ministers and laymen, and especially to those, of whom we fear there are not a few, who have been disposed to think that the Lutheran Church is behind other denominations in works of charity and mercy.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

Commentary on the Book of Job, by George A. Barton, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College. Cloth, 5 x 6 1-2. Pp. xi, 321. Price 90 cents net.

The author in his introduction takes an extremely radical view as to the integrity of the Book of Job. He holds that "the prologue and epilogue belonged to an old folk tale and that there once stood between them a description of Job's demeanor under suffering different from that which we now find there." Moreover it is the author's judgment that the Elihu speeches and various other portions are interpolations. These criticisms would indicate serious mutilations, which to our mind are far from being demonstrated. The comments on the text are rich and suggestive. They are brief but clear.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Basal Belief of Christianity, by James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., author of "Scenes and Sayings in the Life of Christ," etc. Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. ix, 252.

In thirty short chapters the author sets forth the great truths involved in the Christian faith concerning God, Man, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Christian Life, and Last Things. The presentation is popular rather than profound. The style is simple and clear. The book shows how great things can be made plain by a writer who understands his subject and knows how to use language. Pastors will be glad to have such a volume to hand to doubters and to earnest Christian teachers who may want simple and strong arguments in defense of the faith.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Harriet Beecher Stowe, The Story of Her Life, by her son, Charles Edward Stowe, and her grandson, Lyman Beecher Stowe. Cloth. Pp. 313. Price \$1.50 net.

Harriet Beecher Stowe was born a hundred years ago, June 14, 1811. A daughter of the celebrated Lyman Beecher and a sister of the more illustrious son, Henry Ward Beecher, Harriet belongs to the immortals. Her one distinguished achievement, the writing of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, gave her a unique place in the history of the United States. Her work is always mentioned as a factor in hastening the crisis of the slavery agitation which culminated in the Civil War and the abolition of slavery.

The volume before us is "The story of a real character; telling, not so much what she did as what she was, and how she became what she was." There is no attempt at eulogy. The facts of her life are told with appreciation. We see her as she was from her childhood in the New England home of a poor pastor, through her busy life of service, down to her beautiful death. We see her mental struggles in arriving at the full assurance of faith through the mists of Calvinism, her trials as an author amid family cares, and her association with great men are a part of the story. Whittier, Holmes, Lincoln, "George Eliot," Greeley, John Bright, Mrs. Browning, Fields, Hawthorne, Frederick Douglas, Sojourner Truth, Garrison, and many other rare characters were her friends. She lived in a religious and theological atmosphere and was familiar with the deep problems of the schools. Her father was a professor at Lane, and her husband a professor at Andover Seminary. Mrs. Stowe was a noble woman, with enough foibles in her make-up to remind us that she was very human.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GINN AND COMPANY. BOSTON.

Papers on Inter-Racial Problems communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, held at the University of London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited for the Congress Executive by G. Spiller, Hon. Organizer of the Congress. Cloth. Pp. xvi, 484. Price, postpaid, \$2.40.

The Universal Races Congress held in London, July 26-29, 1911, was the most important conference ever held upon the mutual relations and duties of various races and peoples. It can only be compared with the great Parliament of Religions at Chicago in 1893, which in another but a related field marked an epoch. The London Races Congress has focused the mind of the world upon the necessity of mutual respect, good understanding, and real co-operation between the different races of men. Lord Weardale, the president of the congress, properly viewed it as an event in the great movement for international justice and peace; for the wars of our time spring repeatedly

from racial antagonisms and misunderstandings and the exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger. It is therefore fitting that the American edition of the proceedings of this notable congress should be published by the World Peace Foundation in Boston; and the volume will be read as eagerly by the members of the peace societies and the Mohonk Conferences as by the members of the Indian Rights Association and the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The large volume of more than five hundred pages contains not only all the papers presented to the congress, but a complete list of the officers of the congress and the hundreds of persons in all countries (there are nearly two hundred from the United States alone) who were interested in its promotion.

The object of the congress was the discussion, in the light of science and the modern conscience, the general relations between the peoples of the West and the East, between white and colored people, with a view to encouraging, between them a fuller understanding, the most friendly feelings, and a heartier co-operation. Many distinguished scholars of various races and from many lands contributed papers on anthropological subjects. Naturally very large claims were made for their respective races by the authors. The general trend of the papers confirm the proposition of the editor that "there is no fair proof of some races being substantially superior to others in inborn capacity, and hence our moral standard need never to be modified." The congress emphasizes the scientific truth long ago proclaimed by Paul to the proud Athenians that God "made of one every nation of men"—a truth as old as Genesis.

The papers are able and interesting and will do something to promote tolerance and brotherhood. They are a repository of facts concerning human conditions. This volume is a real addition to the study of mankind from many view-points.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections Made Ready for Pulpit Work.

Volume II. First Sunday after Trinity to Thanksgiving.

By Rev. R. C. H. Lenski. Pp. 451.

This volume consists of a series of expositions of the Eisenach Gospel Lessons for the twenty-eight Sundays of The Trinity Cycle, and also for the Reformation Festival, and Thanksgiving or the Harvest Home Festival. Each exposition is followed by a page or more of "Homiletical Hints" and a series of sermon outlines, some of them translated or adapted from leading German divines, but the majority of them apparently the author's own work.

The expositions are quite full and are simple, natural and thoroughly evangelical. The homiletical hints are fresh, striking and suggestive. The sermon outlines are generally constructed after the German type. If properly used, this volume will be very helpful to pastors especially in expository preaching which is at once the most difficult and the most instructive and helpful method of preaching, if well done.

If the book had been given a "Table of Contents," and a textual or topical Index, or both, it would have added very greatly to its value for general use. The paper, binding and typographical work are of very superior quality.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS CO. NEW YORK.

The Homiletic Review, Oct. 1911, is up to its usual high standard as a preachers' magazine in all the various departments which belong their domain. Topics of a homiletic, pastoral, social and reformatory character are ably discussed.

The Missionary Review of the World, Oct. 1911, sustains its reputation as the most comprehensive and able missionary publication in our language. In its general survey of the mission fields of the world it is unexcelled. Many of its articles are illustrated.

The Literary Digest is an almost indispensable weekly visitor to the busy man. It gives him much in little and from all sides—social, political, industrial, scientific, literary and religious.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

PAMPHLETS.

Eucharist or the Lord's Supper. By Carl A. E. Stohlmann. Octavo, pp. 32. The purpose is to establish the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that "the Sacrament of the Altar is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given unto us Christians to eat and to drink, as it was instituted by Christ Himself." Published in English and German by the author. Erie, Pa.

The End of Darwinism. An essay by Alfred P. Schultz, M.D., pp. 17. Published by the author, Monticello, Sullivan Co., N. Y.

In this essay the claim is made that "Not change but persistence is characteristic of life. Every change is essentially a per-

sistence. Only what persists can change. In religion the theory of evolution is atheistic; everything else is a faint-treated compromise. A God that sits so far off as the theory demands is no God."

The Religious Possibilities of the Motion Picture. By Herbert A. Jump, Minister of the South Congregational Church, New Britain, Conn. Printed for private distribution.

The Ideal College President. By Charles W. Super.

Rome vs. America. By D. A. Sommer. (Seventh thousand), pp. 42. Price 20 cents, 3 for 50 cents.

The first edition of this tract was issued with the title, "Letters to Roosevelt on Romanism." This edition is revised and greatly enlarged. Published by the Octographic Review, Indianapolis, Ind.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—its Aims and Tendency. By Rev. Timothy Brosuahan, S.J. Pp. 40.

This essay is issued from 1651 East Main St., Columbus, O., as the Catholic Educational Association Bulletin for August, 1911. It is a severe arraignment of the Carnegie Foundation, and especially of the way in which it is being administered by Mr. Pritchett and the Board of Trustees of which he is the executive head.

Sir Edward Grey on Union for the World Peace; List of Arbitration Treaties, Compiled by Denys P. Myers; Syndicates for War, or the Influence of the Makers of War Material and of Capital Invested in War Supplies; and The Grange and Peace, the Report of the Committee on International Peace adopted by the National Grange at its Annual Convention, 1909. All published and circulated by The World Peace Foundation, 29 A Beacon Street, Boston.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.



Books Which Every Lutheran Should Read

The Lutheran Monograph Series

A new series of timely booklets for popular reading at popular prices.

The Distinctive Doctrines of Lutheranism

By A. G. VOIGT, D. D.

Our doctrines are stated so clearly and simply that they can be grasped by every reader. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Lutheran doctrines.

Present Day Lutheranism

By F. P. MANHART, D. D.

Anyone who wishes to understand the actual situation in the Lutheran Church to-day as regard doctrine, polity and synodical organizations will find it all here in a nutshell.

Is the Ministry an Attractive Vocation?

By DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

A new edition of this stimulating booklet as a number of the Lutheran Monograph Series. It may now be secured at a great reduction in price.

The Miracles of Christ

By the late MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

This monograph is a reprint of Dr. Valentine's lucid and powerful discussion of the nature, the place, the proof and the evidential value of miracles in an argument for Christianity which was contained in Volume I. of his "Christian Theology." Many who cannot possess the larger work will welcome this masterly extract.

Single copies, 5 cents; 50 cents a dozen, net.

The Nature of God

By JOHN A. HALL, D. D.

These chapters are given as the answer of Christian faith to the inquiry, "What is God?" They show the failure of philosophy adequately to answer that inquiry. The author insists upon the divine revelation of Scripture. Many illuminating paragraphs set forth the deep things sometimes hard to understand. One lays down the book with quickened pulses and ardent faith.

\$1.25 net, postpaid

The Post-Apostolic Age and Current Religious Problems

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D. D., LL. D.

Modern progress has cleared up many things, but it has not shaken the central pillars of Christianity. The book contains a general discussion of the time succeeding the apostolic age, and the doctrines taught, and finds that primitive and modern Christianity are essentially the same.—*The Advance*.

The author has read many authorities on the subjects he discusses and his book abounds in valuable quotations. He writes in pleasing style, and the reader will receive many helpful suggestions from the comparison of the doctrines and usages of the time following the Apostles and those of the Protestant period. In this respect the work is unique, and an original contribution to modern apologetic literature.—*G. W. Richards, D. D., in the Reformed Church Review*.

\$1.25 net, postpaid

The Lutheran Catechist

By G. H. GERBERDING, D. D.

This volume has a legitimate place without crowding upon others, for the literature of catechetics in English is not extensive. Doctor Gerberding writes out of his experiences as a pastor for nearly twenty years and as a teacher of prospective preachers for nearly as long a period. The book has been prepared with scholarly thoroughness and with practical ends ever in view. It shows wide reading on the literature of the subject, and will confirm the Lutheran Church in the wisdom of its catechetical practices.—*The Lutheran Observer*.

\$1.50 net, postpaid

SEND US YOUR ORDER FOR ANY BOOK
ON THE MARKET

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 Arch Street, Philadelphia

